

De la bénédiction du roi à la bénédiction de Dieu (Ps 72)

Selon C. Westermann, la théologie, même la théologie biblique, n'a pas accordé à la catégorie de la bénédiction toute l'attention qu'elle mérite⁽¹⁾. La remarque vaut, semble-t-il, en particulier pour le Ps 72⁽²⁾. La présente étude se donne trois objectifs: montrer d'abord que, d'un point de vue littéraire, la bénédiction fournit la clé d'interprétation de l'ensemble du poème; ensuite vérifier la cohérence du message théologique à partir de cette catégorie de pensée et souligner son intérêt pour la réinterprétation israélite de l'idéologie royale proche-orientale; enfin mettre en lumière le fait que toutes les relectures successives de la prière originelle se sont développées dans le cadre de la bénédiction.

I. Le Psaume 72: une prière de bénédiction

Vocabulaire et symbolique

Le terme de bénédiction n'émerge que vers la fin du psaume, mais alors de façon insistante: «on bénira le roi» (v. 15), les «nations se béniront» (v. 17) et la prière s'achève sur une double bé-

⁽¹⁾ C. WESTERMANN, *Der Segen in der Bibel und im Handeln der Kirche*, (Gütersloh 1981) 7ss. A consulter la riche bibliographie de J. SCHARBERT, «brk», *TWAT*, I, c. 808-841, spéc. 809-811, il convient de nuancer cette déclaration.

⁽²⁾ C. WESTERMANN, lui-même ne mentionne ce psaume qu'en passant, soit dans le livre cité à la n. 1, soit plus récemment dans sa *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament* (Genève 1985) 126-146 = *Theologie des Alten Testaments in Grundzügen* (Göttingen 1978) 88-101.

nédiction de YHWH (vv. 18-19). Au total, pas moins de quatre mentions. Surtout, l'ensemble du développement théologique se trouve orchestrer le thème de la bénédiction, telle la béatitude du v. 17b que le parallélisme du vers semble identifier avec elle⁽³⁾. La bénédiction, comme au v. 18 (cf. v. 17a), est souvent associée au nom de celui qui bénit ou qui est béni (Nb 6,22-27: «Ils apposeront ainsi mon nom sur les Fils d'Israël, et Moi je les bénirai»). Ce dernier texte met aussi au centre de la bénédiction le *šālôm* qui signifie tout à la fois plénitude, paix, bonheur, bien-être, harmonie: «Que le Seigneur te bénisse et qu'il te donne la paix». Cette notion de *šālôm* contient aussi une dimension cosmique et peut, comme ici, inclure la fertilité du sol (vv. 3-4.6-7.16). L'image de l'eau fécondante (v. 6) en est un symbole privilégié (Gn 49,25; Si 39,22; Ez 34,26; MI 3,10). Ne tombe-t-elle pas d'en haut (Ez 34,26), comme expression de la générosité et de la gratuité de Dieu, mais aussi comme fruit de sa puissance vivifiante? A l'instar de la pluie fertilisante, la royauté «descend» elle aussi (vv. 6.8) comme effet de la bénédiction divine⁽⁴⁾. Et puisque la justice, thème initial et dominant de tout le poème, est «le fruit de la paix» (Is 32,17), elle rentre, elle aussi, dans le champ de la bénédiction (cf. Ps 24,5) fréquemment associée à la personne du juste (Pr 10,6; 11,11; 28,20; Si 11,22; 40,17 LXX cf. Si 7,32). Il est significatif, à cet égard, que ce soit la première chose que l'on demande à Dieu (Ps 72,1). Langage, images, catégories théologiques convergent donc tous vers cette catégorie de la bénédiction comme principe unifiant de tout le poème. L'analyse de la forme littéraire confirmera cette conclusion. Mais pour le mieux percevoir, il convient de dégager la forme originelle, et pour cela, dans une démarche préalable, de procéder à l'étude de sa genèse.

(3) Sur cette corrélation entre la béatitude et la bénédiction, cf. S. MO-WINCKEL, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, II (Oxford 1967) 47; M. MANNATI, *Les Psaumes*, I (Paris 1966) 83 et n. 4.

(4) De la bénédiction, «l'image la plus immédiate semble être celle d'une descente. La préposition qui suit normalement le mot *b'rākā* est 'al, indiquant que la bénédiction vient se poser sur quelqu'un. Ainsi, dira-t-on que la bénédiction vient "sur la tête" du juste (cf. Pr 10,6; Gn 49,26; Dt 33,16). . . », J. GUILLET, «Le langage spontané de la bénédiction dans l'Ancien Testament», *RSR* 57 (1969) 163-204, cf. p. 170.

Le Ps 72: histoire de la rédaction

Selon S. Mowinckel, le psaume oscille entre la prière et l'oracle, sans qu'apparaissent clairement les raisons de l'alternance⁽⁵⁾. Cet auteur cherche une explication du côté du *Sitz im Leben*: des paroles de style oraculaire, prononcées par un prophète cultuel, auraient été insérées à l'intérieur même de la supplication placée dans la bouche de la communauté⁽⁶⁾. Mais le psaume n'offre aucun marqueur stylistique qui permettrait de reconnaître l'allure dialogale, le passage de l'imploration à la réponse oraculaire. Un grand nombre de critiques préfèrent invoquer le procédé des relectures si fréquemment utilisé dans le corpus des psaumes. Il semble, en effet, que tout le développement soit parsemé d'insertions longues ou brèves qui donnent à cette prière une allure de promesse.

Cette hypothèse se vérifie pour les vv. 9-11. Après la longue série des inaccomplis des vv. 2-7 qui ont tous le roi pour sujet, ces vv. 9-11 introduisent comme sujets des verbes les ennemis ou les rois étrangers. Le début du v. 9 présente une rupture stylistique: «devant lui (le roi) se courberont...». De plus, alors que l'impératif initial du v. 1 confère aux inaccomplis des vv. 2-7 une valeur de jussif, les attaches littéraires de ces v. 9-11 invitent à lire ici des futurs. Ils font en effet écho au célèbre oracle prophétique d'Is 60 (sans doute postexilique) qui met en scène les peuples étrangers apportant à Jérusalem la fortune des nations (Is 60,5; cf. Ps 72,10) et se prosternant en Is 60,10 devant Sion, dans le Ps 72,9 devant le roi judéen: parmi eux les gens (ou rois) de Saba (Is 60,6.16; cf. Ps 72,10b), de Tarsis (Is 60,9; cf. Ps 72,10a). L'expression «lécher la poussière» (Ps 72,9) se retrouve dans un oracle prophétique, inséré lui aussi dans une supplication exilique, pleine d'espérance (Mi 7,17)⁽⁷⁾. Pour désigner les contrées les plus éloignées de la terre, le

⁽⁵⁾ MOWINCKEL, *Psalms*, I, 224; II, 62s. De même MANNATI, *Psaumes*, 303, n. 3 et 304.

⁽⁶⁾ MOWINCKEL, *Psalms*, II, 62.

⁽⁷⁾ Pour la date, cf. B. RENAUD, *La Formation du Livre de Michée* (Paris 1977) 372-376. On relèvera, dans le contexte de cette prière, l'annonce d'une venue des peuples à Sion, sous une formulation très proche de Ps 72,8ss. — E. PODECHARD, *Le Psautier. Traduction littérale et explication historique*, I, *Psaumes 1-75* (Lyon 1949) 311, renvoie aussi à Is 49,23 et à Lam 3,29 et fait remarquer que ces textes parallèles «ont plus de couleur, tandis que dans le psaume l'idée est passée en formule».

Deutéro-Isaïe emploie fréquemment le terme «îles» (cf. Ps 72,10). On notera en outre, que ce thème de la domination universelle ne revient nulle part ailleurs dans le reste du psaume. Bien plus, il interrompt la longue séquence des inaccomplis (avec pour sujet le souverain) qui traite de la mission royale comme d'une mission de justice, de paix et de fertilité du sol. Comme souvent dans ce procédé des relectures, le *kî* «oui» du v. 12 sert de suture rédactionnelle plus ou moins habile, pour atténuer l'effet de rupture provoqué par l'insertion.

Le v. 8 qui traite lui aussi du pouvoir universel, faisait-il partie de l'insertion? L'analyse s'avère ici plus délicate du fait que le sujet de l'inaccompli reste le roi judéen tout comme aux vv. 2-7. Cependant sa thématique diffère du tout au tout de celle de ces versets et rejoint entièrement celle de la péricope qui suit (vv. 9-11). A titre de contre-épreuve, on relèvera que ce v. 8 est presque un décalque de Za 9,10, texte de l'époque du retour et contemporain d'Is 60, avec qui il présente quelques affinités (voir aussi Ps 89,26 et Mi 7,12). Ce passage s'énonce ainsi: «Son gouvernement (celui du roi à venir) sera de la mer à la mer, du Fleuve jusqu'aux extrémités de la terre». La seule divergence que contient le Ps 72,8 consiste dans la substitution de «il descendra (qu'il descende)» à «son gouvernement».

Il semble bien que cette différence s'explique par la volonté d'articuler l'insertion du verset avec les précédents où le roi fonctionne comme sujet. Par ailleurs, en raison du contexte, on traduit souvent le verbe *yārad*, descendre, par «dominer», mais sans offrir de parallèle éclairant. Or ce verbe se retrouve au v. 6 dans son sens habituel: le roi apparaît comme un don de Dieu qui «descend» comme la pluie sur le regain, c'est-à-dire comme une bénédiction. La reprise de ce verbe au v. 8 permet d'étendre à l'ensemble de l'humanité cette puissance et ce privilège de bénédiction. Cet emprunt d'un mot au contexte dans lequel on veut glisser l'insertion relève des procédés usuels des relecteurs. Notons aussi que la représentation du monde habité, au v. 8, reflète une manière de penser babylonienne: «de la mer à la mer» évoque l'espace qui s'étend de la Méditerranée au Golfe Persique; le Fleuve doit être identifié comme l'Euphrate⁽⁸⁾. D'après

⁽⁸⁾ «La première expression mentionne l'extension du royaume de l'Est à l'Ouest, l'autre part du centre (l'Euphrate) vers la périphérie, les extrémités de la terre», MOWINCKEL, *Psalms*, I, 55.

R. Tournay⁽⁹⁾, le terme *'eškār* (v. 10), «présent, tribut» n'est pas sans affinité avec le terme babylonien *eškaru* et ne se retrouve qu'en Ez 27,15. Cette représentation convient mal au domaine du roi israélite et son vocabulaire semble supposer des contacts avec Babylone, c'est-à-dire l'époque de l'exil. En définitive, c'est donc l'ensemble des vv. 8-11 qu'il convient de considérer comme une addition. Le v. 8 fonctionne comme verset de transition: par sa thématique, il s'apparente aux vv. 9-11; par sa forme grammaticale et l'emprunt au v. 6 du verbe «descendre», il s'aligne sur la série des vv. 2-7. Des sutures rédactionnelles: la reprise malhabile de *yārad* au v. 8 et l'addition de *kī*, «oui» au début du v. 12 permettent de délimiter clairement l'insertion⁽¹⁰⁾.

L'intervention rédactionnelle pourrait ne pas se limiter à ces vv. 8-11. Un certain nombre de critiques repèrent des ajouts aux vv. 5.15.17. En effet, au milieu de «plages» consistantes qui traitent de la fonction sociale et cosmique du roi (vv. 1-4.6-7.12-14.15b-16) sont disséminées de brèves notations, relatives non plus à la mission mais à la personne du souverain, qui perturbent quelque peu la séquence des idées. Ainsi le v. 15a «Qu'il vive et on lui donnera l'or de Saba» brise la cohérence des vv. 14.15b: la vigoureuse action du roi en faveur des pauvres appelle logiquement l'invocation sur lui de la bénédiction. On se demande ce que vient faire ici l'or de Saba qui n'est pas sans rappeler l'addition du v. 10. L'introduction *y'hī* «qu'il vive», peut-être emprunté à 1 R 5,1, pourrait avoir été placé ici par assonance avec les deux *y'hī* «que soit» au début des vv. 16 et 17. L'ajout possible du v. 5 irait dans le même sens⁽¹¹⁾: comme au v. 15

(9) R. TOURNAY, «Le Ps 72,16 et le réveil de Melquart», *Mémorial du Cinquantenaire* (Travaux de l'Institut Catholique de Paris 10; Paris 1964) 97-104, spec. 101.

(10) L. JACQUET, *Les Psaumes et le cœur de l'homme. Etude textuelle, littéraire et doctrinale* (Gembloux 1977) vol. 2, 410 parle de dissections arbitraires. Mais les déplacements qu'il propose (p. 406-427) ne constituent-ils pas des expédients encore plus arbitraires, alors que le phénomène des gloses et des relectures est un procédé largement reconnu? On relèvera en outre les contacts étroits entre le Ps 72 et 1 R 8-10, en liaison avec le titre de Salomon, donné tardivement au psaume. Ces attaches mériteraient une analyse plus approfondie.

(11) En adoptant la leçon des LXX: «Qu'il prolonge (ses jours)», *w'ya'ārīk* au lieu de *yīrā'ūka* «qu'ils te craignent», qui provient sans doute d'une relecture piétiste tardive. A qui s'adresse-t-on? Au roi? A Dieu? Ce pronom de la deuxième personne ne réparaît nulle part dans le psaume.

on passe brusquement de l'action à la personne du Messie. On peut donc se demander si ces interventions ne datent pas de la messianisation du psaume. Dans ce cas, il faudrait aussi considérer comme un complément le v. 17: «Que son nom demeure à jamais...», d'autant que le v. 17b évoque les nations et renvoie donc aux vv. 9-11. Ce verset articulerait en conclusion du psaume les deux préoccupations fondamentales de l'interprétation messianique: la mise en relief de la personne du Messie (vv. 5.15a.17a) et sa souveraineté universelle (vv. 8-11.17b).

On ne peut, toutefois, pour ces trois versets (5.15a.17a) aboutir à une certitude. Car le souhait d'une longue vie pour le roi entrait dans les préoccupations israélites de l'époque royale. Si le souverain était bénédiction pour le peuple, ne devait-on pas souhaiter que se prolonge à l'infini son action bienfaisante et donc sa vie? En définitive, plus que la thématique, ce sont les critères d'ordre littéraire, les ruptures dans le texte, qui conduisent à voir ici des retouches.

Mais il se pourrait aussi, au moins en ce qui concerne les vv. 5 et 17a, que le passage de la fonction à la personne marque la fin d'une strophe. Le v. 15a paraît relever plus clairement d'un travail de rédaction, puisqu'il brise la séquence des vv. 12-14.15b et que l'or de Saba renvoie aux vv. 9-11. Quant au v. 17b, avec son allure prosaïque et sa référence aux nations, il fait aussi figure de complément⁽¹²⁾.

De l'avis quasi unanime, les vv. 18-19 constituent une doxologie qui termine le second livre du psautier, à l'analogie des versets 41,14; 89,52; 106,48 qui clôturent respectivement le 1^o, le 3^o et le 4^o livre⁽¹³⁾. Cependant, il ne faut pas en conclure trop vite, comme on le fait habituellement, que ces versets n'ont rien à voir avec la prière précédente. Bien au contraire, une comparaison de Ps 72,18-19 avec les trois autres doxologies citées, fait apparaître une excroissance qui, à la fois, distingue Ps 72,18-19 des autres finales et les rapproche du Ps 72,1-17. Dans ces quatre finales, on retrouve, en effet, à quelques variantes près, la même structure fondamentale en trois temps:

(12) La répartition des termes, par la *BHS*, au v. 17b, pour retrouver un rythme de 2+2 est inadéquate, car elle ne fait pas droit au parallélisme du sens. Celui-ci appellerait un rythme de 3+1!, qui n'a plus grand chose à voir avec la poésie.

(13) Le Ps 150 constitue dans son entier la doxologie finale du cinquième livre et du psautier dans son ensemble.

1. Béni soit YHWH, le Dieu d'Israël	42,14
Béni soit YHWH	89,52
Béni soit YHWH, le Dieu d'Israël	106,48
2. Dès maintenant et à jamais	42,14
A jamais	89,52
Dès maintenant et à jamais	106,48
3. Amen! Amen!	42,14
Amen! Amen!	89,52
Et tout le peuple dira Amen Alleluia	106,48

Tout en gardant la même structure, la doxologie du Ps 72,18-19 présente des développements originaux :

1. Béni soit YHWH Dieu, Dieu d'Israël
Lui qui fait des merveilles, lui seul
Béni soit son Nom de Gloire
2. A jamais
Et sa gloire remplira toute la terre
3. Amen! Amen!

Le nom de YHWH fait écho au nom du roi (v. 17), comme si l'on voulait corriger quelque peu la théologie du psaume originel, en rappelant que la véritable source de la bénédiction c'est le Nom divin lui-même. Par ailleurs, l'universalité du règne du souverain israélite fait place à l'universalité de la Gloire de YHWH, qui remplit toute la terre. Si l'on ajoute que la formule «Béni soit YHWH» renvoie discrètement à la bénédiction que reçoit le roi (Ps 72,15) et qu'il communique (Ps 72,17), on doit conclure que tout en constituant la doxologie finale du second livre du psautier, les v. 18-19 représentent une relecture de ce psaume, sans doute la dernière à être intégrée au texte canonique lui-même.

En résumé, il semblerait que les vv. 8-11 et 17b probablement, les vv. 5 et 17a peut-être, constituent la première strate de réinterprétation, qui vise sans doute à messianiser le psaume. La seconde, qui coïncide avec la division en livres et donc avec la dernière étape de la formation du psautier, reflète une accentuation plus théocentrique. Le psaume originel se composait à tout le moins des vv. 1 (sauf le titre). 2-4.6-7.12-14; 15b. Si l'on intègre les développements épisodiques sur la personne du roi dans le psaume primitif, celui-ci englobait alors les vv. 1-7.12-14.15b.16-17a.

La forme littéraire du poème originel

Quelle que soit l'option retenue, il apparaît de façon claire que, sauf au v. 15b, tous les verbes des propositions principales ont pour sujet le souverain israélite. La séquence ne peut manquer d'impressionner et favorise incontestablement l'unité du psaume. L'impératif du v. 1 confère à ces inaccomplis la valeur d'un jussif à résonance d'optatif. Autrement dit, d'un bout à l'autre, nous sommes en présence d'une prière, plus précisément d'une supplication adressée à Dieu au bénéfice du souverain.

Il convient de préciser davantage: une prière de bénédiction. En effet, cette supplication d'un ton parfaitement serein présente des traits originaux. Il manque un certain nombre d'éléments du modèle formel: on n'y relève par exemple ni «motifs» ni description de l'épreuve; elle se réduit à une pure imploration. Ce fait pourrait suggérer que nous sommes en présence d'une supplication d'un type particulier. A la suite de H. Gunkel, S. Mowinckel a noté avec insistance que, dans leur substance comme dans leur visée, la bénédiction et la prière d'intercession étaient étroitement liées⁽¹⁴⁾. On a voulu voir dans la seconde un dérivé postérieur de la première. A l'origine, la bénédiction (*Segensspruch*), parole chargée de puissance, efficace par elle-même, ne serait pas très éloignée de la magie. La formule «Béni soit N.» exprimerait la certitude que l'effet visé est ou sera nécessairement produit. Plus tard, une conception plus élaborée de la divinité aurait fait surgir des formulations plus respectueuses de la transcendance divine: ce serait le vœu de bénédiction (*Segenswunsch*), la bénédiction se changeant en prière. Mais, comme l'a montré J. Guillet⁽¹⁵⁾, les choses ne sont pas aussi simples. En réalité, la tension entre la constatation et le vœu est intérieure à la bénédiction elle-même, qui n'est ni pure constatation positive à l'indicatif, ni simple vœu plus au moins ardent à l'optatif. Elle est à la fois «un cri d'admiration et de reconnaissance», beaucoup plus proche de l'exclamation que de la pure constatation, et un appel, «une invocation à la puissance qui vient de se révéler, afin qu'elle prenne possession permanente de l'être qu'elle vient de désigner»⁽¹⁶⁾. Il semble

⁽¹⁴⁾ H. GUNKEL, *Einleitung in die Psalmen* (Göttingen 1966) 293-309, spéc. 299-301; MOWINCKEL, *Psalms*, I, 224; II, 62s.

⁽¹⁵⁾ J. GUILLET, «Bénédiction», 186-197.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Ibid., 192.

que l'on puisse vérifier la validité d'une telle analyse dans le Ps 72 qui proclame au v. 15b :

«On priera pour lui sans relâche
On le bénira tout le jour».

Le parallélisme du vers invite à comprendre l'acte de bénédiction comme un vœu de bénédiction : on souhaite que le roi soit béni «tout le jour». Autrement dit, on continuera à faire ce que l'on vient de formuler depuis le début du psaume. Mais en même temps, cette promesse vient au terme d'une longue demande et le second stique «On le bénira» semble supposer que la prière a été exaucée. Devant ce constat d'une bénédiction effective manifestée à tous à travers la justice sociale et l'harmonie au sein de la communauté, «on bénira le roi» qui en est l'acteur. Cela veut dire qu'on lui adressera l'équivalent du «béni es-tu», cri d'admiration et de reconnaissance, mais en même temps on souhaitera que cette bénédiction se prolonge «tout le jour», «béni sois-tu». Le constat de bénédiction entraîne le vœu de bénédiction⁽¹⁷⁾. Ainsi, la catégorie de la bénédiction commande non seulement le registre du vocabulaire et de la symbolique mais aussi celui de la forme littéraire. Notons toutefois une particularité : l'adresse à Dieu et non plus au bénéficiaire : «Béni sois-tu de YHWH». Une telle formulation souligne clairement que la source de la bénédiction se trouve en Dieu seul.

II. La royauté et la théologie de la bénédiction

L'objet de la bénédiction

Un fait ne peut manquer de frapper le lecteur de ce Ps 72 : l'étroite articulation entre la justice sociale et la fertilité du sol. Au v. 3, les montagnes produisent la justice comme les collines la paix. Cette association donne à ce *šālôm* une indéniable coloration cosmi-

⁽¹⁷⁾ Voir les exemples analysés par J. GUILLET, *Ibid.*, 188-190. Ainsi, le livre de Ruth passe de la prière de bénédiction (2,19) à la constatation de la bénédiction et à la célébration du béni (2,20). Le mouvement est inversé pour les bénédictions de Judith (Jdt 13,18 d'une part, 15,8-10 d'autre part).

que. Pour parler de la «justice»⁽¹⁸⁾, le v. 7 utilise le langage de la fécondité: «qu'elle fleurisse», et c'est encore au moyen d'une comparaison tirée du monde de la nature que le v. 6 présente l'avènement du roi (cf. aussi le v. 5). La séquence des vv. 12-14.15b.16 confie à la mission royale aussi bien l'exercice de la justice que la fertilité du sol. Cette imbrication suggère que l'instauration de la justice a des effets bénéfiques jusque sur le cosmos lui-même, et permet aux bénédictions divines de descendre à profusion sur la terre. Une telle association se retrouve en Is 9,6; 32,15-19; dans certains psaumes royaux (Ps 132,15-18); et en 2 S 23,1-7, le «testament de David». Mais jamais elle ne s'affirme avec autant de force que dans le Ps 72⁽¹⁹⁾.

Qu'il y ait emprunt à l'idéologie royale proche-orientale, la chose est amplement démontrée⁽²⁰⁾. La royauté antique plongeait ses

(18) TM: «Que le juste soit florissant». Mais avec quelques manuscrits hébreux, les versions grecque et syriaque, il est préférable de lire *šedeq* la justice plutôt que *šādiq* le juste. On retrouve ainsi le parallèle justice/paix du v. 3.

(19) Dans une note fort érudite, «Ps LXXII, 16», VT 38 (1988) 214-220, A. CAQUOT vient de proposer une nouvelle traduction: «Qu'il (= le roi) soit une plante vivace sauvage sur la terre (ou dans le pays), que son feuillage abonde comme (celui d'un cèdre du) Liban, et qu'ils (= ses rejetons) fleurissent depuis la ville comme l'herbe de la terre». De la sorte, «le v. 16 du Ps LXXII n'a ainsi pour objet que la postérité du roi et non la prospérité agricole». Cette traduction n'est pas satisfaisante pour les raisons suivantes:

1. Bien que «le registre d'images choisi ici par le psalmiste soit dominé par les métaphores végétales» (p. 217), la traduction de *pissat bar* par «plante sauvage» reste une pure conjecture.

2. A. Caquot ne traduit pas «au sommet des montagnes». C'est peut-être un oubli, mais en rattachant *yir'aš* au vers suivant il perturbe la rythmique régulière du vers 3+3 et transforme le double distique du TM en un simple tristique.

3. Il semble qu'il y ait beaucoup de «non-dits» dans le texte, témoin le nombre de parenthèses que l'auteur doit introduire pour expliciter le sens. Ainsi, le passage du singulier (il = feuillage) au pluriel (ils = rejetons) n'est pas des plus évidents.

4. La formulation «fleurir depuis la ville comme l'herbe de la terre» reste bien alambiquée et confuse.

5. La dimension cosmique de la fonction royale est suggérée déjà au v. 3. Il n'y a rien d'étonnant à la retrouver ici.

Ce verset reste énigmatique et n'a pas encore livré tous ses secrets.

(20) Voir par exemple H. CAZELLES, *Le Messie de la Bible* (Paris 1978) 31-58 et 225-233 avec abondante bibliographie. Cf. aussi E. W. NICHOLSON,

racines dans la sacralité du cosmos. Par delà les personnifications mythologiques dans lesquelles le divin se concrétisait, celui-ci s'identifiait avec les forces vitales de la nature. Au cœur de ces religions, naturistes par essence, le roi tenait une place centrale, il fonctionnait comme intermédiaire entre le monde d'en-haut, celui des dieux, et le monde d'en-bas, celui de la nature auquel les hommes étaient soumis et qui était traversé de forces redoutables appelées divinités. Au roi revenait le soin d'apaiser ces divinités souvent capricieuses, de se les rendre favorables par des rites d'intercession et de propitiation. En lui, les forces de la nature étaient comme maîtrisées et ordonnées au bien de l'humanité. Le souverain apparaissait donc comme indispensable à la permanence et à la cohésion aussi bien de la collectivité humaine que du cosmos. Ainsi doté d'une mission de réconciliation, il se trouvait situé au cœur des représentations théologiques comme de l'organisation rituelle. Ces représentations et ces liturgies pouvaient varier selon les espaces culturels, mais, que le souverain fût divinisé, comme en Egypte, ou non, l'institution royale était reconnue comme une participation fonctionnelle à la royauté divine: «la royauté descend des cieux».

Tout en la purifiant profondément, comme nous le verrons, de ses relents polythéistes, la conception israélite de la royauté adopte cette manière de voir: «Nous aurons un roi, et nous serons, nous aussi, comme les autres nations», déclarent les Israélites à Samuel (1 S 8,28, cf. 8,5). Il est significatif qu'au v. 6 du Ps 72, le roi «descend comme la pluie», donc du ciel⁽²¹⁾. On comprend dès lors que le psaume le présente comme le garant aussi bien de la paix sociale que de la fertilité de la terre.

S'il y a un terme qui, dans ce psaume, définit la double fonction du roi, c'est bien le mot *šedāqā*, que nous traduisons bien maladroi-

God and his People (Oxford 1986) 193-196. A l'époque récente, il n'y a guère qu'A. FEUILLET à la refuser, «Les problèmes posés par l'exégèse des Psaumes. Quatre psaumes royaux (II, XLV, LXXII, CX)» *RevThom* 85 (1985) 5-37, spéc. 26-29. Cet auteur date ce cantique «messianique» de l'époque postexilique et fait appel au style anthologique.

(21) La correction proposée par H. GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen* (Göttingen 1968) 309, qui intervertit les deux premiers mots du v. 6 «Comme la pluie qui descend...» ne s'impose pas. Elle n'est appuyée par aucun témoin textuel et elle perturbe la séquence des verbes de cette section. Sur l'adoption de cette conception sacrale, cf. CAZELLES, *Messie*, 59-76 et GUNKEL, *Psalmen*, 307 et la prière babylonienne qu'il cite.

tement par le mot justice. Cette *šēdāqā* est l'apanage du roi, l'objet de la première demande (v. 1) qui formule le thème central. Littérairement, elle donne le ton à ce qui suit: l'impératif confère aux inaccomplis qui suivent une valeur de jussif. Thématiquement, cette *šēdāqā* résume toutes les demandes qui suivent: celles concernant la justice sociale (cf. v. 4) — et le roi apparaît comme le «sauveur des pauvres» (vv. 12-14) —, mais aussi la richesse du cosmos. Elle «semble avoir été comprise d'une façon éminemment spatiale, un peu comme un domaine, un champ de forces dans lequel les hommes sont placés et rendus capables de certaines actions... un champ de forces salutaires à l'homme»⁽²²⁾. Le peuple fait corps avec sa terre, l'alliance avec le peuple est en même temps alliance avec le pays: les pluies, les moissons, les vendanges *sont* la justice de Dieu, puisqu'elles en sont la manifestation. Dans ce sens, on peut parler de «justice cosmique»⁽²³⁾. Dans le Psaume 24,5 justice et bénédiction (c'est-à-dire l'effet de la bénédiction) semblent s'identifier: «Il (l'homme au cœur pur) obtiendra de YHWH la bénédiction, de Dieu, son Sauveur, la justice». De par sa fonction dans la société, le roi devient le canal des bénédictions.

Une telle conception de la *šēdāqā* la rend proche de la *Maat* égyptienne qui englobe aussi bien la vérité, le droit, la justice que l'ordre primordial, l'ordre cosmique; «elle garantit la stabilité du monde cosmique, humain ou social»⁽²⁴⁾. Le statut de cette *Maat* est difficile à définir: déesse, elle est comme descendue des cieux dans le monde des hommes. Elle préside à l'organisation harmonieuse de l'univers contre les forces chaotiques qui le menacent. Elle investit le

⁽²²⁾ G. VON RAD, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Münich 1957) I, 388 = *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament*, I (Genève 1971) 325. Voir E. BEAUCAMP, *La Bible et le problème de la justice* (Blois 1970) (repris de *Etudes Franciscaines* XIX, n° 50, 1969).

⁽²³⁾ Cf. G. PIDOUX, «Un aspect négligé de la justice dans l'Ancien Testament», *RTP*, 4 (1954) 283-288 qui renvoie à Os 2,21-22, à Ps 85,12-13, Is 45,8, Joel 2,23s. On pourrait ajouter Ps 65,6-14: à la prière du pécheur, Dieu «dans sa justice» répond par des merveilles, à savoir la stabilité du cosmos, la paix mondiale et la fécondité du sol. Cf. Ps 37,2; 42,2-3; 133,3s.

⁽²⁴⁾ G. VON RAD, *Die Weisheit in Israel* (Neukirchen 1970) 100s = *La Sagesse en Israël* (Genève 1976) 89s. Voir aussi A. VOLTEN, «Der Begriff der Maat in den Ägyptischen Weisheitstexten», dans *Sagesse du Proche-Orient Ancien* (Travaux du Centre d'Etudes Supérieures spécialisé d'Histoire des Religions de Strasbourg) (Paris 1963) 73-102.

pharaon, enfant, comme elle, du dieu solaire Rê, et le mandate pour maintenir cet ordre primordial. «Recevant et communiquant *Maat*... le roi participe à la fonction bienfaisante du dieu soleil»⁽²⁵⁾. Dans le Ps 72, la figure du roi judéen, investi de la justice pour assurer le fonctionnement du monde dans ses dimensions humaines et cosmiques, présente certaines analogies avec celle du pharaon égyptien. Elle s'en distingue par le rejet de toute divinisation du monarque, mais aussi par l'insistance mise à présenter cette justice humaine et cosmique comme le fruit de la bénédiction divine, et à ce titre, un fruit sans cesse à demander et à recevoir.

La source de la bénédiction

A cet égard, le premier verset met d'emblée les choses à leur place: «Dieu, *donne* au roi *ta* justice...». La justice appartient en propre à Dieu; il est le «juste juge» (Ps 75,3.8; 82,3-5). Tout exercice humain du pouvoir n'est qu'exercice délégué. La longue série des jussifs-optatifs de ce verset initial confère à la prière le ton d'une supplication instante. Elle paraît suggérer que Dieu pourrait retirer ce don, au grand dam de toute la communauté. Elle accentue ainsi la dépendance du roi par rapport à Dieu. Le souverain a besoin qu'on prie pour lui, «qu'on le bénisse» (v. 15b), en l'occurrence qu'on invoque Dieu en sa faveur, pour qu'il bénéficie des dons divins et toute la prière peut être interprétée dans ce sens. Elle fait apparaître le roi comme tout relatif à Dieu, en même temps qu'elle l'arrache à la divinisation. La fonction royale s'origine bien en Dieu, mais elle advient à l'homme par la médiation d'une parole qui implique une distance, une certaine extériorité entre la divinité et le souverain, une parole instauratrice qui suscite le roi comme partenaire de Dieu dans la gestion du monde. L'ambiguïté qui affectait la *Maat* égyptienne disparaît totalement. La justice divine communiquée au roi ne lui confère pas un statut divin, mais constitue un don gracieux de Dieu qu'il faut demander et recevoir tout le jour et chaque jour (v. 15b). Ainsi la relation à Dieu n'est plus envisagée sous l'angle ontologique mais fonctionnel. S'il «descend» du ciel (vv. 6.8), le roi n'est pas de rang divin. Sans vouloir établir de dépendance littéraire, on peut avancer l'analogie de Gn 1,26-28 qui traite de la création de l'hom-

(25) CAZELLES, *Messie*, 34s.

me, selon la tradition sacerdotale. Ce rapprochement apparaît d'autant plus éclairant qu'il s'agit ici encore de fonction royale. L'homme est «à l'image de Dieu» et l'on sait que dans les sources orientales, cette représentation s'appliquait en premier lieu au roi⁽²⁶⁾. Mais en Gn 1, l'homme créature («créé à l'image de Dieu») ne reçoit son pouvoir de «dominer la terre» (pour la représentation cf. Ps 8, hymne à l'homme vice-roi de la création) que grâce à la parole de bénédiction, tout comme dans le Ps 72. Bien plus, dans les deux cas, ce pouvoir royal et cette souveraineté sont associés au mystère de la vie, objet central de la bénédiction divine dans la Bible, à la fécondité humaine en Gen 1, à la fertilité du sol dans le Ps 72.

Il y a plus. La bénédiction ne se contente pas, négativement, d'arracher la royauté israélite à la mythologie de l'identification divine. Positivement, elle permet d'ancrer cette royauté dans le projet et l'action de Dieu. Dans sa *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament*, C. Westermann vient de rappeler opportunément que l'action divine ne se limite pas à son action événementielle qui s'accomplit dans les grandes interventions salvifiques. Elle comporte aussi une dimension intérieure à l'histoire, qui donne à celle-ci son unité et son dynamisme créateur. Cette dimension intérieure, cette action silencieuse s'appelle la bénédiction:

L'Ancien Testament ne se contente pas de relater une série d'événements suscités par les grands actes de Dieu. Il contient des passages intermédiaires où, dans une action silencieuse, Dieu donne croissance et prospérité, fait naître et grandir des enfants, accorde la réussite au travail. Le Dieu qui sauve est aussi le Dieu qui bénit... La bénédiction ne concerne pas les heures extraordinaires, comme l'expérience d'une libération par exemple, mais le déroulement quotidien des jours⁽²⁷⁾.

Bénédiction et histoire du salut représentent donc deux modalités différentes mais complémentaires de l'action de Dieu dans le monde. La royauté se réfère à la première de ces modalités. Telle que la présente le Ps 72, la mission royale relève exclusivement du quotidien: l'instauration de la justice, la fertilité du sol. Il n'est pas ici question de conquête. On comprend dès lors, qu'elle se rattache à la bénédiction. Celle-ci, tout en sauvegardant la transcendance divi-

(26) P.-E. DION, «Ressemblance et image de Dieu», *DBSup*, X, 365-403, spéc. 395.

(27) WESTERMANN, *Théologie de l'AT*, 126s.

ne, en instituant entre la divinité et le roi la distance d'une parole instauratrice et créatrice, permet de relier à Dieu l'institution royale et à cette dernière de s'intégrer dans la foi proprement yahviste. L'idéologie et les représentations royales se trouvent arrachées à la mythologie naturiste; elles sont purifiées mais non pas éliminées. Sous cet angle, on peut dire que la bénédiction sert de relais, de médiation entre cette idéologie royale proche-orientale et la conception israélite de la royauté.

Le phénomène est d'autant plus remarquable, que, de par ses origines yahvistes, celle-ci se rattachait à la ligne du salut et non à la bénédiction. Les rois n'étaient-ils pas d'une certaine manière, les successeurs des chefs charismatiques, appelés juges, dont la mission essentielle consistait en une mission de délivrance occasionnelle, conjoncturelle? Les juges étaient des sauveurs. Mais la transformation de la judicature en institution royale entraînait un déplacement significatif de la fonction: la royauté ne se limitait plus à poser des actes exceptionnels, fussent-ils merveilleux, mais à se préoccuper du quotidien de la vie, qui relevait davantage du champ de la bénédiction que de celui de l'histoire du salut. Bien plus, cette adoption de l'institution royale s'accompagnait de l'adoption du principe d'une monarchie héréditaire. Le pouvoir royal se transmettait par la voie de la génération qui participait au mystère de la transmission de la vie, objet essentiel et premier de la bénédiction. La mention, dans le Ps 72,1, du «fils de roi», peut prendre ici tout son sens. La bénédiction s'inscrit dans le phénomène de la génération, vecteur de la continuité dynastique (cf. en 2 S 7, la promesse transmise par Natan à David et qui concerne sa *maison*, c'est-à-dire sa descendance).

La particularité de cette forme de souveraineté consiste en ceci qu'en elle, la fonction familiale du père s'unit à la fonction politique du souverain du peuple. Voilà qui fonde le fait que, dans la royauté dynastique, le roi est roi avec sa famille et que la continuité de la royauté est rendue possible par la naissance d'un fils. Cette transposition de la continuité familiale, telle qu'elle se dessine dans les généalogies, en une continuité politique donne sa signification universelle à la forme de souveraineté que constitue la royauté⁽²⁸⁾.

A vrai dire, les choses ne sont pas toujours aussi nettes que dans le Ps 72. Certains aspects de la royauté israélite relèvent de

(28) WESTERMANN, *Théologie de l'AT*, 134.

l'action salvifique de Dieu. J. Scharbert⁽²⁹⁾ n'a peut-être pas tout à fait tort de reprocher à C. Westermann de trop séparer les deux modalités de l'action divine. En Gn 12,1ss, la Promesse se trouve très tôt (tradition jahviste) formulée en termes de bénédiction. De ce fait, celle-ci est, par ce biais, intégrée à l'histoire du salut⁽³⁰⁾. Le Ps 72 lui-même offre quelques traces de cette imbrication. Car le roi hérite ici d'un langage réservé d'ordinaire à Dieu, au Dieu qui sauve: le roi sauve *yāša'* (v. 4), libère *nāṣal* (v. 12), rachète *gā'al* (v. 14), tous verbes qui caractérisent l'histoire divine du salut⁽³¹⁾, à laquelle la mission royale se trouve intégrée.

Le roi bénéficiaire et médiateur de bénédiction

Nous pouvons maintenant mesurer de façon plus précise la mission du roi en fonction même de cette catégorie de la bénédiction. Car s'il en est au premier chef le bénéficiaire (cf. Ps 21,4), le souverain n'en est pas le seul. Le locuteur du Ps 72, celui qui appelle sur le roi les bienfaits divins, ne peut guère être que la communauté ou son porte-parole. Nous sommes ici en présence du schéma où l'inférieur bénit le supérieur. Quel est le sens de cette démarche? Le fruit de la bénédiction que l'on appelle sur le roi concerne en réalité la communauté elle-même, qu'il s'agisse de la paix sociale (vv. 2-4.12-14) ou de la fertilité du sol (vv. 7.16). Comme nous l'avons vu, le v. 15b «on le bénira» associe le constat de bénédiction au vœu de bénédiction. La réalisation effective de ce qui est demandé aux vv. 12-14, la justice sociale, le rétablissement du pauvre dans sa dignité et dans ses droits, conduira à proclamer béni le souverain.

⁽²⁹⁾ SCHARBERT, «*brk*», 839.

⁽³⁰⁾ Cf. CAZELLES, *Messie*, 79-81; WESTERMANN, *Théologie de l'AT*, 129-131.

⁽³¹⁾ F. DUMORTIER, *La fin d'une foi tranquille* (Paris 1978) 47s n. 24. «Dans le Psautier:

- YHWH est toujours le sujet du verbe sauver (*yāša'*). Ps 76,10; 109,31; 20,10): il est alors présenté comme le juge qui prend fait et cause pour le pauvre.

- A l'exception du Ps 82,4, libérer (*nāṣal*) est l'apanage de YHWH (Ps 35,10; 70,2; 97,10).

- comme pour libérer, racheter est typique de YHWH lors de la geste de l'exode (Ps 77,16; 106,10...).

Bénir quelqu'un n'est pas simplement énoncer un souhait... Bénir quelqu'un c'est entrer en contact avec lui, établir entre les âmes un courant de vie. Courant réciproque, ce qui permet aux plus faibles de bénir le meilleur, non dans l'idée de l'enrichir de ses minces richesses, mais dans l'espoir de capter à son profit le courant une fois établi et de voir déborder sur sa propre personne les trésors les plus riches⁽³²⁾.

Dans cette perspective, au Ps 72,15, le peuple bénit le roi pour avoir part à sa bénédiction. Quel que soit le sens précis de ce verset, il est clair que toute la prière va dans ce sens. On prie pour le roi, pour qu'il soit le «canal des bénédictions divines»⁽³³⁾. On le bénit, on appelle sur lui la bénédiction pour qu'il devienne médiateur de bénédiction, voire la bénédiction même, comme semble le suggérer le v. 6 «qu'il descende comme l'averse sur le regain, comme la pluie sur l'herbe»⁽³⁴⁾. C'est aussi ce que déclare explicitement le Ps 21,7: «Tu (toi Dieu) fais de lui (le roi) une bénédiction (littéralement: tu l'as placé comme bénédiction) pour toujours». En 2 S 6,18 (= 1 Ch 16,2), David bénit le peuple, comme Salomon en 1 R 8,14.55⁽³⁵⁾. Le roi fonctionne donc comme intermédiaire entre Dieu et le peuple d'une part, entre Dieu et le cosmos d'autre part. Mais en définitive, le peuple demeure le bénéficiaire ultime de la bénédiction, car la fertilité du sol se veut au service de la prospérité de la communauté. On comprend dès lors que l'objet central de la bénédiction soit la justice. Si elle assume une dimension cosmique, elle reste fondamentalement cette action dynamique qui instaure la paix sociale, l'ordre et l'harmonie au sein de la communauté. Elle est la bénédiction même (Ps 24,5).

(32) GUILLET, «Bénédiction», 179; *VTB* «bénédiction», c. 122.

(33) E. JACOB, *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament* (Neuchâtel 1968) 191: «C'est lui (le roi) qui assure la vie du peuple qui serait voué au désastre hors de sa présence (Lam 4,20)».

(34) On ne voit pas sur quoi se fonde la note n de la *TOB* qui voit ici une ambiguïté et se demande «s'il s'agit de Dieu ou du roi». Car tous les verbes antécédents et subséquents ont le souverain pour sujet. Il doit en être de même ici.

(35) Le souverain israélite s'approprie des fonctions sacrales qui étaient celles du roi dans l'idéologie proche-orientale. Cf. CAZELLES, *Messie*, 39, 42s, 49-52.

III. Les relectures du psaume et la bénédiction

Par son vocabulaire, sa symbolique, sa forme littéraire et sa vision théologique de la royauté, le Ps 72 se structure donc autour du thème de la bénédiction. Les réinterprétations postexiliques vont, elles aussi, se déployer à l'intérieur de cette catégorie de pensée. Rappelons qu'elles se situent à deux niveaux: celui de la relecture messianique d'abord avec l'insertion des vv. 8-11 et de leur corrélat le v. 17b; celui de la doxologie des vv. 18-19 ensuite, ajoutés lors de l'organisation du psautier en livres.

La réinterprétation messianique

Avec la disparition de l'institution royale, lors de la chute de Jérusalem en 587 av. J-C., les représentations attachées à la royauté israélite vont se projeter sur la figure idéale du Messie de la fin des temps. Le langage messianique est largement commandé par celui de la promesse. Israël recueille avec gratitude les oracles concernant les temps eschatologiques. Ainsi ne nous étonnons pas de relever comme première note caractéristique de la réinterprétation messianique du Ps 72, la transformation de la prière de bénédiction en promesse de bénédiction. Nous avons relevé le style oraculaire des v. 8-11 en référence aux prophéties de Za 9,10 et d'Is 60. Ce style va se répercuter sur l'ensemble du psaume. Comme il arrive souvent dans la Bible, une relecture ne se contente pas de compléter, elle réinterprète. Or les inaccomplis qui avaient reçu valeur de jussifs de par leur articulation avec l'impératif du v. 1, vont maintenant subir l'influence des vv. 8-11 et se transformer tout naturellement en futurs. Le système des verbes hébraïques se prête à une telle transposition. La version des Septante représente un témoin autorisé, même si elle n'est pas tout à fait logique dans son interprétation, puisqu'elle ne fait commencer la série des futurs qu'à partir du v. 4. Ainsi relu, le Ps 72 devient ce que C. Westermann appelle une description du salut (cf Is 9,6; 11,1ss). Or, précisément, selon cet auteur, cette forme d'oracle «n'a pas sa racine dans la prophétie mais dans d'anciennes formules de bénédiction»⁽³⁶⁾. Elle n'annonce pas un événement pré-

⁽³⁶⁾ C. WESTERMANN, *L'Ancien Testament et Jésus-Christ* (Paris 1972) 34s. Du même auteur, *Der Segen*, 36-38.

cis qui doit venir, mais procède à une description d'une réalité future, de l'ère du salut. Aussi prend-elle une dimension universelle et cosmique. L'addition des vv. 8-11 et 17b se révèle tout à fait significative à cet égard, puisqu'elle élargit à tous les peuples l'horizon du psaume. Du reste, le Ps 72 se prêtait à une telle relecture, car il insistait avec force sur le *šālôm* fruit de la justice (Ps 72,3.7, cf. Is 32,17). Or le *šālôm*, la «paix», se trouve au cœur même des descriptions du salut. Le fait deviendra patent, si l'on se souvient que Za 9,10, source du Ps 72,8, provient d'un oracle qui annonce le Messie, roi pacifique: «Voici que ton roi s'avance vers toi. . . humble, monté sur un ânon, le petit d'une ânesse. Il supprimera d'Ephraïm le char de guerre et de Jérusalem le char de combat. Il brisera l'arc de guerre et il proclamera la *paix* (le *šālôm*) pour les *nations*. Sa domination s'étendra d'une mer à l'autre, et du Fleuve jusqu'aux extrémités de la terre».

Ainsi, cette relecture messianique articule plus étroitement la bénédiction et l'histoire du salut. Déjà, nous l'avons vu, certains éléments du vocabulaire, dans le psaume originel, préparaient cette imbrication. Mais ici les choses deviennent beaucoup plus nettes. La bénédiction ne regarde pas seulement l'avenir, elle s'enracine dans le passé. Le v. 17 renvoie discrètement à la bénédiction abrahamique de Gn 12,1-3 (cf. 22,17s; 26,4; 35,9-13). Divers indices littéraires suggèrent le rapprochement des deux textes: d'abord le lien du nom avec la bénédiction. Même si, comme il est possible, seul le v. 17b a été rajouté par le relecteur, il l'a été pour être placé à cet endroit, et c'est donc le v. 17, dans son entier, qui, à ce niveau de rédaction, peut fonctionner comme écho de Gn 12,1-3. Ce dernier texte lie l'annonce de la bénédiction à Abraham, tandis que le Ps 72,17 la rattache au roi. Surtout, Abraham, en Gn 12,1-3, le roi, en Ps 72,17, sont présentés comme le lieu théologique de la bénédiction. En Gn 12,3 il faut sans doute donner au niphâl le sens réfléchi: «En toi se béniront les nations de la terre». Mais quel sens donner à cette formulation? Avec des critiques de plus en plus nombreux⁽³⁷⁾, nous pouvons comprendre: «En toi toutes les nations de la terre acquerront la bénédiction» ou «auront part à la bénédiction». Pour C.-A. Kel-

(37) Cf. R. MARTIN-ACHARD, *Actualité d'Abraham* (Neuchâtel 1969) 68ss qui renvoie aux positions de H.-W. Wolff, J. Schreiner etc. . .

ler, l'action s'accomplit dans un sujet, sans que le sujet lui-même soit considéré comme son acteur⁽³⁸⁾. L'hitpael du Ps 72,17 doit revêtir une signification analogue. Déjà Gn 22,18, reprise de Gn 12,1-3, substitue un hitpael au niphal, avec sans doute le même sens. D'ailleurs, comme nous venons de le voir, tout le psaume considère le roi comme médiateur de bénédiction entre Dieu et le peuple. Le v. 17b ne fait qu'élargir aux nations cette fonction et ces privilèges royaux⁽³⁹⁾. Ajoutons que les deux perspectives se développent dans le cadre de la famille. L'histoire patriarcale est une histoire familiale. Le pouvoir de la royauté s'incarne, sous une forme dynastique, dans la personne du roi et de sa descendance. D'une certaine manière, c'est aussi une affaire de famille. Et la bénédiction, associée au mystère de la vie et de sa transmission, sert tout naturellement dans les deux cas de moyen d'expression (cf. Gn 1,26-28).

On mesure tout de suite la portée de ce rapprochement. Si le Ps 72,17s se réfère à Gn 12,1-3, ces versets enracinent profondément la royauté dans l'histoire du salut. En J, la promesse qui ouvre sur l'avenir s'exprime en termes de bénédiction. L'histoire du salut devient une histoire de la bénédiction et le Ps 72 projette sur le Messie l'accomplissement de cette promesse. Le roi des temps eschatologiques se trouve ainsi l'héritier des privilèges abrahamiques. La bénédiction patriarcale à l'orée de l'histoire trouvera son prolongement dans la bénédiction du Messie au terme de l'histoire. Du coup, les limites nationalistes éclatent. A l'instar de la promesse abrahamique, la royauté messianique se fera médiatrice de bénédiction universelle.

⁽³⁸⁾ C.-A. KELLER, «*brk*», *THAT*, I, 364. Il relève aussi qu'en Gn 18,17s c'est la seule interprétation possible: Dieu révèle à Abraham son secret, parce que celui-ci doit jouer un rôle particulier dans son plan de salut universel (cf. encore dans le même sens Gn 28,14).

⁽³⁹⁾ Les contacts entre les deux textes pourraient être plus étroits, si, comme le pense H. CAZELLES, «*Pentateuque*», *DBSup*, VII, 796s, le Jahviste se référait, en filigrane de son œuvre, à la royauté. Écrit dans le contexte de la monarchie judéenne, cette tradition viserait à fonder la légitimité de la dynastie davidique, en s'intéressant aux problèmes de succession, à la manière dont se transmet le pouvoir qui, dans le projet divin, ne revient pas nécessairement au premier-né. Ce faisant, «il démythise la royauté. Ce n'est pas une révélation à David qui fait de lui l'élu: l'élu c'est Abraham», *Id.*, *Messie*, 79-81.

La signification de la doxologie

Bénies grâce à la médiation royale, les nations, en retour, bénissent le roi⁽⁴⁰⁾, en le proclamant «heureux» (v. 17b). Déjà, le v. 15b esquissait un mouvement semblable de la part du peuple. La doxologie remonte plus haut: du médiateur de la bénédiction à la source même de la bénédiction: «Béni soit YHWH...» (v. 18). Il y a cohérence et progression tout à la fois entre les divers niveaux d'interprétation. Dans la prière originelle, le peuple bénissait le roi; dans la relecture messianique, les nations le Messie. Maintenant tous ensemble bénissent YHWH. Mais c'est toujours le même schéma qui est employé, celui du pauvre qui bénit le riche, le faible qui bénit le puissant.

Bien sûr, la formule ne peut pas signifier que l'homme puisse transmettre quelque chose à Dieu. Elle jaillit plutôt du trop-plein d'un cœur comblé, comme une réponse au geste du Seigneur qui vient «d'accomplir des merveilles» (v. 18b), en révélant ses projets de bénédiction, au centre desquels se trouve le Messie. Quand elle s'adresse à un homme, la formule «Béni soit N...» traduit l'élan émerveillé devant un être en qui Dieu fait éclater sa puissance et sa générosité. Certes, la formule n'est pas ici employée pour le Messie, mais le v. 17 en fournit l'équivalent. En tout cas, cette explosion de joie et d'enthousiasme ne s'arrête pas à l'élu privilégié, elle remonte à sa source, à Dieu même: «Béni soit YHWH...» Béni soit son Nom de gloire (v. 18). Selon J. Guillet⁽⁴¹⁾, «normalement la bénédiction de l'homme jaillit, lorsqu'il découvre que Dieu le premier a donné sa bénédiction». Pour crier «Béni soit Dieu», il faut avoir reconnu «Dieu a béni». Ici, l'être béni, le Messie, est dans le monde comme une révélation, un signe de la bénédiction divine ou plutôt de Dieu lui-même, le *bārûk*, le Béni par excellence, celui qui possède la bénédiction en plénitude. Ainsi se justifie le titre de cette étude: de la bénédiction du roi à la bénédiction de Dieu, qui résume tout le mouvement du psaume en sa rédaction ultime⁽⁴²⁾. Cette formule

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Sur les relations entre macarisme et bénédiction, cf. M. A. KLOPFENSTEIN, «'šr», *TWAT*, I, 260; CAZELLES, «'šr», *THAT*, I, 481-485.

⁽⁴¹⁾ GUILLET, «Bénédiction», 20.

⁽⁴²⁾ Au cours de l'histoire, les dons divins à David ou à sa descendance ont conduit à bénir YHWH (cf. 1 R 1,48; 5,21; 10,9 [= 2 Chr 9,8]). On notera que tous ces textes sont situés au cœur de l'évocation du royaume salomonien (cf. Ps 72,1).

conclusive s'apparente de bien près au mouvement de louange et d'action de grâces, ou peut-être mieux à la confession de foi en la puissance illimitée et la générosité inépuisable du Seigneur et finalement en la personne même de Dieu, puisque le Nom de Gloire (v. 19) c'est Dieu lui-même.

On aurait pu croire le prière achevée. Or le psaume qui commence par une supplication, se termine sur une supplication: «Que toute la terre soit remplie de sa Gloire». Ici se vérifie encore ce que nous avons dit de la bénédiction. De par sa nature même, celle-ci représente une réalité dynamique qui doit rayonner et se répandre. Evoquer la source et la plénitude de la bénédiction, c'est, par le fait même, désirer ardemment voir rejaillir sur soi, sur le monde, ses effets et ses richesses. Le petit, le faible, le pauvre, dont il est question tout au long de ce psaume, ne peut que souhaiter voir déborder sur lui la générosité du puissant. Si la plénitude de la bénédiction se concentre dans la réalité du Nom divin, du «Nom de Gloire» (v. 18), on ne peut que désirer et souhaiter voir la Gloire de ce Nom se répandre jusqu'aux extrémités de la terre (v. 18). En raison même de sa nature, la prière de bénédiction doit sans cesse passer de la demande à l'action de grâces et inversement. Tant que l'avènement des temps messianiques restera objet de promesse, la bénédiction, du moins dans sa réalisation plénière, ne pourra pas cesser d'être objet d'espérance.

32 Avenue Gal de Gaulle
67000 Strasbourg
France

B. RENAUD

SUMMARY

The theological category of benediction, which occurs repeatedly at the end of the poem, provides an important key to the interpretation of the whole of Ps 72. First of all, it serves as a reference axis to the vocabulary and to the symbolism of the psalm, and it allows the recognition of the literary form, which fluctuates between prayer and oracle. It also serves as a medium of Israelite theology in order to integrate into its vision of faith the overall representation of the order of the world and of the place which the institution of the royalty holds in it, while purifying them of any polytheistic or idolatrous taint. Finally, a genetic analysis of the piece shows that the successive rereadings of the original kernel developed within the framework of benediction.

Hearing, Seeing, and Believing in the Gospel of John

Faith and unbelief are central concerns for the Fourth Evangelist, and a major facet of the issue is the connection between faith and seeing Jesus' signs and resurrection appearances. The problem has long been a disputed point among interpreters of the Fourth Gospel. Some have argued that the evangelist disparages faith based on signs (John 2,23-25; 20,29), since true faith must be based on the word⁽¹⁾, but another interpreter insists that signs were performed and recorded precisely to evoke faith (20,30-31)⁽²⁾. Some have suggested that signs produce an inadequate form of belief which can grow into true faith (3,2)⁽³⁾, but others have pointed out that signs

(¹) J. BECKER, "Wunder und Christologie: Zum literarkritischen und christologischen Problem der Wunder im Johannesevangelium", *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 130-148; L. SCHOTTRUFF, *Der glaubende und die feindliche Welt: Beobachtungen zum gnostischen Dualismus und seiner Bedeutung für Paulus und das Johannesevangelium* (WMANT 37; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1970) 251-258. Cf. R. BULTMANN, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Philadelphia 1971) 696; W. WILKENS, *Zeichen und Werke: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des 4. Evangeliums in Erzählungs- und Redestoff* (ATANT 55; Zürich 1969) 44, 141-142; E. HAENCHEN, *John* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1984) I, 237, II, 212.

(²) M. M. THOMPSON, *The Humanity of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel* (Philadelphia 1988) 63-64. Cf. M. DE JONGE, *Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God. Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective* (SBLSPS 11; Missoula, MT 1977) 136.

(³) BULTMANN, *John*, 131, 207-209; S. HOFBECK, *Semeion: Der Begriff des "Zeichens" im Johannesevangelium unter Berücksichtigung seiner Vorgeschichte* (Münsterschwarzacher Studien 3; Münsterschwarzach 1966); R. E. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John* (AB 29-29A; Garden City, NY 1966; 1970) I, 195-196, 530-531; W. NICOL, *The Semeia in the Fourth Gospel: Tradition and Redaction* (NTS 32; Leiden 1972) 99-106; R. KYSAR, *John: The Maverick Gospel* (Atlanta 1976) 67-73; R. FORTNA, *The Fourth Gospel and Its Predecessor: From Narrative Source to Present Gospel* (Philadelphia 1988) 247-250. Cf. WILKENS, *Zeichen*, 59.

are rightly perceived only by those who already have faith (11,40)⁽⁴⁾. Some conclude that the initial faith was produced by the word⁽⁵⁾.

A number of these studies have investigated the problem thematically, attempting to discern a coherent view of seeing, hearing, and faith in the relevant portions of the gospel in its present form⁽⁶⁾. The difficulty is knowing how to assess the various passages, since the gospel refers to signs in both positive and negative ways, and uses "believe" for both inadequate and genuine types of faith. Other studies rely on source and redaction analysis to ascribe the more positive view of signs to a "signs source" and the more negative view to a redactor⁽⁷⁾. The problem is that scholars have not been able to agree on the criteria that can be used to distinguish redactional levels or on the extent of a possible signs source.

An alternative approach is a literary one that again takes the gospel in its present form, but focuses on the characters as representatives of various types of faith. R. Alan Culpepper, for example, suggests that the evangelist uses the characters to attract readers to positive exemplars of faith, evoke sympathy for inadequate responses, and alienate readers from characters who reject Jesus⁽⁸⁾. This approach is a promising one which can be developed further by noting how characters are *juxtaposed* in the gospel. The Fourth Evangelist's use of juxtaposition has sometimes been noted, but has not been fully developed as an interpretive tool. Yet attention to juxtaposition can help to clarify the role seeing, together with hearing, in the genesis of faith.

⁽⁴⁾ DE JONGE, *Jesus*, 135-136; R. KYSAR, *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel* (Minneapolis 1975) 69-73; id., *Maverick*, 71-72; R. SCHNACKENBURG, *The Gospel According to St. John* (New York 1968; 1980; 1982) I, 519; M.-É. BOISMARD, "Rapports entre foi et miracles dans l'Évangile de Jean", *ETL* 58 (1982) 357-364, esp. 357.

⁽⁵⁾ F. SCHNIDER - W. STENGER, *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Vergleich ihrer Parallelen* (Biblische Handbibliothek 9; München 1971) 83.

⁽⁶⁾ See the works by Thompson, de Jonge, and Hofbeck, in notes 2 and 3, above. See also C. TRAETS, *Voir Jésus et le Père en lui selon l'Évangile de Saint Jean* (Analecta Gregoriana 159; Rome 1967) 225-243.

⁽⁷⁾ See the works by Bultmann, Fortna, Becker, Nicol, Schottroff, Wilkens, and Boismard in notes 1, 3, and 4 above.

⁽⁸⁾ R. A. CULPEPPER, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia 1983) 99-148; R. F. COLLINS, "The Representative Figures in the Fourth Gospel", *Downside Review* 94 (1976) 26-46, 118-132.

John 1,19-51

The narrative portion of the gospel begins with an interchange between John and a delegation from Jerusalem (1,19-28), an account of John's testimony to Jesus and its effect on two of his own disciples (1,29-39), and a description of the effect of their words and Jesus' words on Peter, Philip, and Nathanael (1,40-51). The evangelist structured the initial interchange in two scenes of approximately equal length (1,19-23.24-28), by repeating that the delegation had been sent from the Jews or Pharisees (1,19.24), and by referring to the Christ, Elijah, and the prophet (1,20-21.25). In the next part of the passage the evangelist again created two scenes of approximately equal length (1,29-34.35-39) by repeating references to "the next day" and to John seeing Jesus coming or walking, by the announcement "Behold the Lamb of God (1,29.35-36), and by stressing the word "remain" (*menein*; 1,32-33.38-39). The two pairs of scenes are connected by the presence of John the Baptist, and by the references to his testimony, his reasons for baptizing, and the unknown character of the coming one (1,26.31). Despite these connections, the Jerusalem delegation presents a striking contrast to John the Baptist and his disciples⁽⁹⁾.

The questions of the Jewish delegation centered on messianic expectations; they wanted to know if John was the Christ, Elijah, or the prophet, who was presumably the prophet like Moses (Deut 18,15-18). John bluntly denied that he was the one they were expecting. They pressed the point, however, asking why he was baptizing if he was not the Christ, Elijah, or the prophet. John replied with the startling statement, "Among you stands one whom you do not know" (1,26). His remark suggests that their messianic expectations did not adequately prepare them to recognize Jesus. It also raises the question of how one *does* recognize Jesus as the coming one.

John the Baptist answers the question by acknowledging that he himself did not recognize Jesus at first (1,31.33), but was able to do so because God *spoke* to him and said, "The one on whom you see the Spirit descend and remain, this is he who baptizes with the Holy

⁽⁹⁾ The diptych technique in John 1,19-28 and 29-34 has also been noted by G. MLAKUZHYYL, *The Christocentric Literary Structure in the Fourth Gospel* (AnBib 117; Rome 1987) 117. Cf. CULPEPPER, *Anatomy*, 126-127.

Spirit" (1,33). Later, the words which John heard were confirmed when he *saw* the Spirit descend and remain on Jesus. The same pattern continues in 1,35-39. John the Baptist saw Jesus again and said, "Behold the Lamb of God". Two of his disciples followed Jesus when "they *heard* him say this" (1,37). When Jesus asked them, "What are you looking for?" they did not voice any of the messianic expectations found earlier in the chapter. Instead, they asked "Where are you staying?" and Jesus answered, "Come and you will see" (1,39). The disciples responded to what they heard, saw where Jesus was staying, and remained with him.

The text does not suggest that Jesus did anything extraordinary there, but in the next scene Andrew announces, "We have found the Messiah" (1,41). Peter came to Jesus because of what Andrew had said (1,41-42). Next Philip responded to Jesus' own command, "Follow me" (1,43) and in turn told Nathanael what he had found (1,45). Even though Philip's claim ran counter to Nathanael's own expectations, Nathanael went to Jesus, who told him, "Before Philip called you, when you were under the fig tree, I saw you" (1,48). When Nathanael heard these enigmatic words he acclaimed Jesus as "Son of God" and "King of Israel" (1,49). Jesus identifies Nathanael's response as a confession faith, and promises that Nathanael and the other disciples will see even greater things. "Because *I said* to you, I saw you under the fig tree do *you believe?* You [singular] *shall see* greater things than these. . . you [plural] *will see* heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man" (1,50-51).

John 2

The promise to Nathanael anticipates chap. 2, which contains two short episodes: the miracle at Cana and the cleansing of the temple. There are important reasons to think that these episodes should be read together. First, the stories are linked thematically. In each, Jesus used a Jewish institution to reveal something about his identity and mission. The water jars at Cana were once used for "the Jewish rites of purification" (2,6), but became vessels of the wine through which Jesus revealed his glory (2,11). The Jerusalem temple was the central cultic institution for Jews in the first century, but Jesus anticipated its replacement by his own crucified and resur-

rected body (2,19-21)⁽¹⁰⁾. Both episodes anticipate Jesus' passion or "hour" (2,4.21) and include the theme of signs and faith (2,11.18.23-25).

Second, there are striking formal similarities between the two stories, which can be seen in the following outline. The difference is that the main action occurs after the verbal exchange at Cana and before it at the temple.

<i>John 2,1-12</i>	<i>John 2,13-25</i>
SETTING: Cana (2,1-2)	SETTING: Jerusalem (2,13)
	MAIN ACTION (2,14-17)
	Temple cleansing
VERBAL EXCHANGE (2,3-5)	VERBAL EXCHANGE (2,18-20)
Jesus' mother says wine is gone	Jews demand a sign
Jesus speaks of his "hour"	Jesus speaks of "temple"
Jesus' mother shows	Jews show
uncomprehending confidence	uncomprehending skepticism
MAIN ACTION (2,6-10)	
Water changed to wine	
NARRATOR'S COMMENT (2,11)	NARRATOR'S COMMENT
	(2,21-22)
Jesus manifested his glory	When Jesus was raised
his disciples believed	his disciples believed
TRANSITIONAL SCENE (2,12)	TRANSITIONAL SCENE (2,23-25)
Jesus goes to Capernaum	Jesus does not trust those
with mother, brothers,	who believed because of
and disciples	the signs

Despite the thematic and formal similarities between these two episodes, they present responses to Jesus that are strikingly different. The verbal exchanges in both passages began when someone asked Jesus for something — implicitly at Cana and explicitly in Jerusalem. In both cases Jesus responded by abruptly shifting the plane of conversation to the "hour" of his passion or to the destruction and resurrection of the "temple" of his body. Yet Jesus' mother showed uncomprehending confidence in him, while the bystanders in the temple reacted with uncomprehending skepticism.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Cf. C. H. DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1953) 303; D. M. SMITH, *John* (Philadelphia ²1986) 20; E. C. HOSKYNs, *The Fourth Gospel* (London ²1947) 185.

Contrasting responses to Jesus also appear at the end of each passage. The Cana story concludes, "This, the first of his signs, Jesus did at Cana in Galilee, and manifested his glory, and his disciples believed in him" (2,11). The tone of the verse indicates that faith was the appropriate response to the sign and by accompanying his mother and disciples to Capernaum, Jesus gave tacit approval to their responses (2,12). In Jerusalem the results were different. After the resurrection the disciples would connect the temple cleansing with belief in the scriptures and Jesus' words. But Jesus did not entrust himself to the others in Jerusalem who believed on the basis of the signs that he did during the festival. The juxtaposition of these scenes raises a question: Why did people at Cana respond with confidence or acceptable faith, while those at Jerusalem showed skepticism or unacceptable faith⁽¹¹⁾?

As in chap. 1, people's expectations are an important factor. Jesus' mother was confident that Jesus could do something about the lack of wine, but she did not demand that he act in a specific way. She told the servants, "Do *whatever* he tells you"⁽¹²⁾. In contrast, the bystanders in the temple insisted that Jesus demonstrate his authority by performing a miraculous act or "sign" and expressed skepticism when Jesus refused to conform to their expectations by doing a miracle.

Another factor is, again, the importance of hearing. Those who began following Jesus because they heard a word about him or from him were later able to discern the significance of his actions. The first disciples followed Jesus because they heard that he was the Lamb of God (1,36) or Messiah (1,41). Philip heeded Jesus' command to follow (1,43) and Nathanael believed because Jesus said "when you were under the fig tree I saw you" (1,48-50). *The sign they saw at Cana did not evoke an initial faith. Rather, the sign confirmed and was perceived by a faith that had been engendered through hearing*⁽¹³⁾.

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf. CULPEPPER, *Anatomy*, 90.

⁽¹²⁾ See recently F. J. MOLONEY, "From Cana to Cana (Jn. 2:1-4:54) and the Fourth Evangelist's Concept of Correct (and Incorrect) Faith", *Salesianum* 40 (1978) 817-843.

⁽¹³⁾ Culpepper maintains that the disciples' confessions in chap. 1 should be distinguished from the faith mentioned in 2,11. Nevertheless, the same verb, *pisteuein*, is used in 1,50 and 2,11, and in 1,50 it does refer to an

In contrast, the people who came to Jesus because of what they saw him do were later confounded by what they heard him say. The bystanders saw Jesus cleanse the temple, asked to see a sign, but expressed skepticism when Jesus spoke of raising "this temple" in three days. The unreliable faith mentioned in 2,23-25 is the natural corollary to the skepticism of 2,20. The people in the temple did not believe because Jesus did not conform to their expectations. Others in Jerusalem did believe because Jesus apparently did conform to their expectations of a miracle-worker, but Jesus was wary of such faith. The disciples, however, were able to discern the meaning of what they saw Jesus do in the temple because they remembered what Jesus had *said* and believed the scripture and the *word* which he had spoken (2,22).

John 3,1-4,42

The contrast between Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman in John 3-4 continues the pattern that emerged in the previous chapters. The characters seem to be exact opposites⁽¹⁴⁾. Nicodemus was Jewish, a man, and one who held a respected position in society. His counterpart is a Samaritan, a woman, and one whose social status was dubious. Nicodemus went to Jesus "by night" (3,2) and the woman encountered Jesus in broad daylight at "about the sixth hour" (4,6).

Formally, both episodes consist largely of dialogues; neither contains a miraculous sign or a dramatic action like the temple cleansing. The initial conversations (3,1-21; 4,1-30) unfold through the use of the technique of misunderstanding, which focuses on being "born anew" (*gennēthēnai anōthen*) in 3,3-9 and "living water" in

acceptable form of faith. See K. H. RENGSTORF, "*sēmeion, ktl.*", *TDNT* VII, 251; TRAETS, *Voir Jésus*, 126; SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, I, 319; BROWN, *John*, I, 87; COLLINS, "Representative Figures", 34-36; B. LINDARS, *The Gospel of John* (NCB; Grand Rapids - London 1972) 119. Although C. K. Barrett says that Nathanael's faith was based on miracle (*The Gospel According to St. John* [Philadelphia 1978] 186), it was clearly based on what was heard, not on what was seen.

(14) BROWN, *John*, I, 180, 185; COLLINS, "Representative Figures", 37-38; M. M. PAZDAN, "Nicodemus and the Samaritan Woman: Contrasting Models of Discipleship", *BTB* 17 (1987) 145-148.

4,7-15. The difference is that after 3,9 Nicodemus fades from the scene, while in chap. 4 the woman remains an active partner in conversation.

These initial encounters are followed by interludes which consist of dialogues between John the Baptist or Jesus and their respective disciples (3,22-30; 4,31-38). The dialogues develop the themes of water (3,5.22-26) and food (4,8.31-34) which were introduced earlier in each chapter⁽¹⁵⁾. Each includes an initial comment to the "rabbi" (3,26; 4,31), a response and reminder of something the disciples themselves said (3,27-28; 4,34-35), and a comment about rejoicing (3,29; 4,36).

The interludes are followed by short conclusions which unify the episodes by recapitulating and developing themes mentioned earlier in the chapter (3,31-36; 4,39-42). The conclusion of the third chapter (3,31-36) refers to "from above" (3,3.7.31), the one who comes down from heaven (3,13.31), testimony (3,11.32-33), the one God sent (3,17.34), the Spirit (3,5-8.34), faith and eternal life (3,15-16.36), and the contrast between those who do and do not believe (3,18.36)⁽¹⁶⁾. The conclusion of the account of Jesus in Samaria (4,39-42) repeats the woman's comment that Jesus "told me all that I ever did" (4,29.39) and recalls how the Samaritans came to Jesus (4,30.40), adding that they acclaimed Jesus as the "Savior of the world". The major elements follow a "sandwich" pattern similar to that of 18,15-27 (cf. Mark 5,21-43; 11,12-25), and can be summarized as follows⁽¹⁷⁾:

<i>John 3,1-36</i>	<i>John 4,1-42</i>
INITIAL ENCOUNTER (3,1-21)	INITIAL ENCOUNTER (4,1-30)
Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus	Jesus' conversation with the Samaritan woman

⁽¹⁵⁾ BROWN, *John*, I, 155; LINDARS, *John*, 162.

⁽¹⁶⁾ BROWN, *John*, I, 159-160. John 3,31-36 is so closely connected to the Nicodemus episode that some interpreters rearrange the text, inserting 3,31-36 after 3,21. See J. H. BERNARD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John* (ICC; Edinburgh 1928) I, xxiii-xxiv, 123; BULTMANN, *John*, 160; SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, I, 380. But 3,31-36 actually seems to summarize all of 3,1-30. See DODD, *Interpretation*, 308-311; BROWN, *John*, I, 160.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Cf. LINDARS, *John*, 193.

INTERLUDE (3,22-30)
 John and his disciples
 CONCLUSION (3,31-36)

INTERLUDE (4,31-38)
 Jesus and his disciples
 CONCLUSION (4,39-42)

Like previous instances of juxtaposition, these passages are connected thematically, by references to water (3,5.22-26; 4,7-15), "testimony" (3,11.26.28.32-33; 4,39), Spirit (3,5-8.34; 4,23-24), and eternal life (3,15-16.36; 4,14). The reference to John baptizing at Aenon near Salim (3,23), which was apparently in Samaria, prepares for Jesus' movement into the region, and the interlude in each chapter deals with the success of Jesus' ministry. The imagery of the bridegroom and bride in 3,29 also anticipates Jesus' conversation with the Samaritan woman by the well, a scene that deals with the woman's marital history, recalls OT courtship scenes (Gen 24,10-61; 29,1-14; Exod 2,15-22), and results in a new relationship between Jesus and the Samaritan people⁽¹⁸⁾.

As before, the characters in these passages respond quite differently to Jesus. Nicodemus was one of the people who believed in Jesus because of the signs (2,23; 3,2), but when Jesus made unexpected comments about being "born anew", Nicodemus became completely baffled. Jesus replied, "If I have told you earthly things and you do not believe, how can you believe if I tell you heavenly things?" (3,12). The signs had not prepared Nicodemus to believe Jesus' words. Genuine "seeing" means seeing or entering the kingdom of God (3,3.5) and seeing or having eternal life (3,36). Such vision can only come from a new birth and a faith that receives Jesus' testimony (3,11.33). The statement that Nicodemus did not receive Jesus' testimony, which is repeated at the end of the chapter, indicates that Nicodemus's positive response to the signs did not lead naturally to genuine faith.

In contrast to Nicodemus, the Samaritan woman encountered Jesus without knowledge of his signs. Jesus initiated conversation with her in a way that ran counter to her expectations of Jewish men (4,9), but she persisted in the conversation and was struck by Jesus' unexpected knowledge of her past (4,29.39). She told the

⁽¹⁸⁾ On the connections between chaps. 3 and 4 see B. OLSSON, *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel: A Text-Linguistic Analysis of John 2:1-11 and 4:1-42* (ConB 6; Lund 1974) 209-210; LINDARS, *John*, 172; BARRETT, *John*, 228.

townspeople, "Can this be the Christ?" (4,29), a question that technically expects a negative answer. The context, however, indicates that she was verging on faith and the evangelist himself speaks of her "testimony" to Jesus (4,39). Unlike Nicodemus, the Samaritans *believed because of the woman's word* and later heard Jesus for themselves (4,39) so that "many more *believed because of his word*" (4,41-42).

John 4,46-5,16

The stories of the healing of the official's son in 4,46-54 and the healing of the invalid in 5,1-16 provide a similar contrast. Although these stories have some affinities to Synoptic accounts⁽¹⁹⁾, their present form and collocation are unique to John. Scholars have often posited a sharp break between these stories, since 4,46-54 marks the completion of Jesus' journey to Galilee which began in 4,3, and since 5,1-16 introduces a controversy in Jerusalem which continues for the remainder of the chapter⁽²⁰⁾. Some interpreters even rearrange the sequence in order to group together the episodes that occur in Galilee (4,46-54; chap. 6) and those set in Jerusalem (chaps. 5 and 7)⁽²¹⁾.

Nevertheless, there are good reasons to read these passages together. First, both episodes involve miracles of healing, which are common in the Synoptics but are infrequent in John, and both demonstrate the power of Jesus' life-giving word, a theme which remains important in the discourse in 5,19-47⁽²²⁾. Second, the formal similarities between these texts create scenes that are mirror opposites.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Matt 8,5-13 and Luke 7,1-10, and Mark 2,1-12 and parallels.

⁽²⁰⁾ BARRETT, *John*, 13; SMITH, *John*, 38.

⁽²¹⁾ BERNARD, *John*, I, XVII-XIX; BULTMANN, *John*, 209-210; SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, II, 5-9.

⁽²²⁾ DODD, *Interpretation*, 318; A. FEUILLET, *Johannine Studies* (New York 1965) 44-51; J. N. SANDERS - B. A. MASTIN, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John* (HNTC; New York 1968) 156-161; CULPEPPER, *Anatomy*, 138; HOSKYNs, *Fourth Gospel*, 249; G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John* (Word Biblical Commentaries 36; Waco, TX 1987) 67.

John 4,46-54

SETTING: Cana (4,46)

INITIAL ENCOUNTER (4,47-50)

Man approaches Jesus
 Jesus puts man off with a
 comment about "wonders"
 Man again requests healing
 Jesus promises healing
 Man leaves believing

AFTERMATH (4,51-54)

Encounter with servants who
 announce healing
 Man checks on time
 of healing
 Man believes
 Man's household believes

John 5,1-16

SETTING: Jerusalem (5,1-5)

INITIAL ENCOUNTER (5,6-9)

Jesus approaches man
 Man puts Jesus off with a
 comment about a wonder
 Jesus again offers healing
 Man experiences healing
 (Man leaves not knowing
 Jesus' name)

AFTERMATH (5,10-16)

Encounter with Jews who
 announce sabbath violation
 Jesus checks on man
 who was healed
 Man reports Jesus
 Jews persecute Jesus

In the first scene the official initiates contact, persists in asking for healing, and believes. The result is that the whole household comes to faith. In the second scene, it is Jesus who initiates the contact and persists in offering healing even though the invalid shows no sign of faith. The man eventually reports Jesus to the authorities, who in turn persecute Jesus. The sharp contrast between these episodes again raises the question as to why some people respond to Jesus with faith, while others show unfaith or hostility.

As before, hearing and expectations play an important role. The Galilean official made the journey to Cana because "he *heard* that Jesus had come from Judea to Galilee" (4,47). Even though his son was at the point of death, the man abandoned his expectation that Jesus would have to come to Capernaum to heal the boy, and he returned alone, believing the *word* that Jesus spoke: "Your son will live" (4,50). The servants confirmed Jesus' words when they reported that "his son was living" (4,51). The official checked on the time of healing and recalled Jesus' words (4,53a) with the result that his faith was confirmed and spread throughout his household (4,53b)⁽²³⁾.

⁽²³⁾ The use of *pisteuein* with the dative in 4,50 and the absolute use in 4,53 may indicate a growth in the official's faith (BROWN, *John*, I, 512-513; SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, I, 561-562; BARRETT, *John*, 245), but it was a faith

In contrast, the invalid at Bethzatha was unresponsive to what he heard. When Jesus spoke to him he responded by complaining about his inability to benefit from the wonders of the pool. Although the man showed no sign of faith, Jesus commanded him to take up his pallet and walk and the man was healed instantly⁽²⁴⁾. After experiencing healing he did take up his pallet and walk, but when confronted for violating the sabbath he laid the responsibility on the one who had healed him. Later, Jesus reminded him of his new-found health and warned him not to continue in sin (*mēketi hamartane*; 5,14). Since the Fourth Evangelist understands sin as unbelief and the actions that proceed from it, Jesus apparently was warning him not to persist in unbelief⁽²⁵⁾. His words had no visible effect on the man, who reported Jesus to the authorities.

The invalid at Bethzatha, like the crowds in 2,23-25, demonstrates that simply seeing or experiencing a miracle is no guarantee of faith. Moreover, the story indicates that the man's unbelief was not due to some failure on Jesus' part, since it was Jesus who consistently initiated contacts with him. The story of the Galilean official, however, shows how one who first followed Jesus on the basis of hearing and who believed Jesus' word was able to discern the meaning of the signs. The sign in turn confirmed his faith, as the first Cana miracle confirmed the disciples' faith⁽²⁶⁾.

John 6,1-21

A similar pattern appears in the juxtaposition of the crowd's reaction to the feeding of the five thousand and the disciples' response to Jesus walking on the sea. These stories do appear togeth-

based on the word and confirmed by the sign. See WILKENS, *Zeichen*, 34; SCHNIDER – STENGER, *Johannes*, 83.

(²⁴) The command in John 5,8 also appears in Matt 9,6; Mark 2,11; Luke 5,24. In the Synoptics the effect is that the man *rose* immediately. John says he was *healed* immediately and only *rose* afterward.

(²⁵) The use of the present tense in the prohibition suggests that Jesus wanted to stop something that was already in progress. On sin as unbelief see John 8,24; 15,22.24; 16,9. Cf. BARRETT, *John*, 80-81; J. L. MARTYN, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Nashville 1979) 71.

(²⁶) On the similarity between the Cana miracles see esp. MOLONEY, "Cana to Cana", 826-827; THOMPSON, *Humanity*, 71-72.

er in Mark 6,32-52 and Matt 14,13-33, and were almost certainly conjoined in the sources available to the Fourth Evangelist. The present Johannine form of these stories, however, contrasts the responses of the crowd and the disciples in a way that is not found in the Synoptics but is consonant with examples of juxtaposition elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel.

As before, there are thematic connections between the episodes. Both involve difficulties in the realm of nature: a need for food and a storm at sea. The gift of bread and the incident at the sea recall the Exodus and fit well with the Passover motif that runs throughout the chapter⁽²⁷⁾. The theme of bread, the "I am" statement (6,20), and signs, continue to play an important role in the discourse in 6,25-59.

The evangelist framed the basic story of the feeding of the five thousand with references to the crowd's perception of Jesus. At the beginning of the chapter, the evangelist says that "a multitude followed him because they saw the signs which he did on those who were diseased" (6,2). After recounting the miracle, he adds, "When the people saw the sign which he had done, they said, 'This is indeed the prophet who is coming into the world!'" (6,14). The crowd expected that such a prophet would assume political power, but before they could seize Jesus and make him king, he withdrew to the mountain alone.

The disciples' response to Jesus at the sea is quite different. First we note that in John's account the miraculous aspects of the incident are remarkably ambiguous in comparison with the Synoptic accounts⁽²⁸⁾. The disciples had travelled three or four miles (6,19), but the evangelist does not say that they were in the middle of the lake (cf.

⁽²⁷⁾ On the Exodus motif, see B. GÄRTNER, *John 6 and the Jewish Passover* (ConNT 17; Lund 1959) 14-20; A. GUILDING, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System* (Oxford 1960) 61-68. Cf. BROWN, *John*, I, 255; SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, II, 29-30.

⁽²⁸⁾ BERNARD, *John*, I, 185 and SANDERS - MASTIN, *John*, 183 interpret the incident in a non-miraculous way. BROWN, *John*, I, 252, BARRETT, *John*, 280-281, and LINDARS, *John*, 245-246, note the obscure points, but conclude that the evangelist understood the incident as a miracle. J. P. HEIL's study, *Jesus Walking on the Sea: Meaning and Gospel Functions of Matt 14:22-33, Mark 6:45-52 and John 6:15b-21* (AnBib 87; Rome 1981) 16-17, 75-83, gives insufficient attention to the ambiguities in John's account.

Mark 6,47; Matt 14,24). The text does not indicate that Jesus looked like a ghost or that he actually got into the boat (cf. Mark 6,49.51; Matt 14,26.32). The concluding statement that "immediately the boat was at the land to which they were going" (John 6,21) could mean that they were miraculously whisked to safety, but given only John's account one might think that the boat had already drawn near the shore. Most importantly, John does not say that Jesus stilled the storm (cf. Mark 6,51; Matt 14,32). The evangelist probably assumed that the incident did involve a miracle, but the muted way in which the miraculous aspect of the story is recounted focuses attention on Jesus' words *egō eimi, mē phobeisthe*, "I am, do not be afraid" (John 6,20). The words *egō eimi* were almost certainly a part of the evangelist's source, but in the present form of the narrative they may connote divinity, giving the story the character of a theophany⁽²⁹⁾. In any case, the disciples were frightened when they "saw Jesus walking on the sea" (6,19), but when Jesus *spoke* to them they wanted to take him into the boat (6,20-21a)⁽³⁰⁾.

The contrasting responses to Jesus in these stories continue the pattern noted earlier. The crowd followed Jesus because of what they had seen Jesus do and interpreted the sign according to their own expectations. By fleeing, Jesus makes clear that the crowd missed the point of the miracle. They ate their fill of the bread, but did not rightly perceive the sign (6,26.30). In subsequent conversation with Jesus at Capernaum (6,25-59) they are confounded by his words, like the people in Jerusalem in chaps. 2-3. The disciples' response, however, focused on what they heard Jesus say at the sea, and later, when some withdrew because of Jesus' hard sayings

⁽²⁹⁾ On the importance and possible theophanic character of Jesus' words in 6,20 see DODD, *Interpretation*, 345; BROWN, *John*, I, 254-255; SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, II, 27; BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 89-90. Others caution against this view, e.g. BERNARD, *John*, I, 187; BARRETT, *John*, 281; HAENCHEN, *John*, I, 280. Cf. C. H. GIBLIN, "The Miraculous Crossing of the Sea (John 6.16-21)", *NTS* 29 (1983) 96-103, esp. 98; HEIL, *Jesus Walking*, 79-80. Although Lindars concludes that the *egō eimi* is not theophanic here, he recognizes that the expression is central to the narrative (*John*, 246-247).

⁽³⁰⁾ Heil insists that by "majestically walking on the sea Jesus has manifested his complete dominance over it" and that the disciples' desire to take Jesus into the boat was a response to this miracle (*Jesus Walking*, 81). But his attempt to argue the point, despite the lack of any reference to the stilling of the storm, is not convincing.

(6,60.66), Peter voiced the loyalty of the twelve by telling Jesus, "You have the *words* of eternal life" (6,68)⁽³¹⁾.

John 7-12

The characters in chaps. 7-12 continue to develop along the lines established in chaps. 1-6 and demonstrate that Jesus' works and the scriptures are rightly perceived only by those who already believe. Only the main elements can be summarized here. The Jews in Jerusalem were trying to kill Jesus for "making himself equal with God" (5,18; 7,1.25). Jesus had previously invoked his works and the scriptures as witnesses to the truth of his claims (5,36.39), but such testimony had not convinced his Jewish listeners (5,45-47). Despite the hostility in Jerusalem, Jesus' brothers challenged him to do his works there, which revealed their unbelief (7,3-5). When Jesus returned to Jerusalem, many of the authorities rejected him because he acted contrary to their understanding of the scriptures (7,15.42.49.52). Some of the crowd did respond positively to Jesus because of the signs he had done (7,31) and the words he had spoken (7,40-41). Yet the faith of these "Jews who had believed in him" (8,30-31) was not genuine because his word found no place in them (8,37), and, after a verbal battle, they attempted to stone him (8,59)⁽³²⁾.

The blind beggar (chap. 9), unlike the others in Jerusalem, had no apparent expectations of Jesus. Jesus initiated contact with the man, anointed his eyes with clay, and said "Go wash in the pool of Siloam" (9,6-7a). Like the disciples in chap. 1 and the official in 4,50, the beggar responded to what Jesus said *before* he had seen any miracle (9,7b.11), which sets him apart from the representatives of an inadequate "signs faith"⁽³³⁾. His

⁽³¹⁾ On the contrast between the crowd and the disciples see HOSKYNS, *Fourth Gospel*, 277-278; BROWN, *John*, I, 255; SCHACKENBURG, *John*, II, 29; GIBLIN, "Miraculous Crossing", 98-99.

⁽³²⁾ Both "the Jews" and "the crowd" are used for those who are hostile to Jesus (7,1.43-44) and for those who believe in him for a time (7,31; 8,31). Cf. CULPEPPER, *Anatomy*, 125-132.

⁽³³⁾ Cf. CULPEPPER, *Anatomy*, 147; SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, II, 243; RENGSTORF, "*sēmeion*", 251. Contrast NICOL, *Sēmeia*, 102; MARTYN, *History and Theology*, 71; COLLINS, "Representative Figures", 42.

initial response was not complete faith, but it was a trusting obedience which intensified as the man was questioned repeatedly about the identity of the healer (9,11.17.27.33). Finally, when Jesus spoke to him again, the beggar confessed his faith and worshiped (9,35-38). In contrast, the few Pharisees who responded favorably to Jesus on the basis of his signs (9,16b) quickly gave way to those who opposed him for breaking the sabbath (9,16a.24.28-29).

In chap. 10, which is the sequel to the story of the blind man (see 10,21), Jesus stresses that those who belong to his sheep are those who hear his voice. He insists that his works and the scriptures do bear witness to him (10,25.32-38), but the hostile reaction of the crowd indicates that such testimony is *actually accepted* only by those who already have faith (10,31.39). The hostility of those in Jerusalem contrasts sharply with the faith of the people at Bethany, who believed that what John the Baptist had said about Jesus was true, even though John had done no sign (10,40-42).

In chap. 11, Martha and Mary send word to Jesus that "he whom you love is ill" (11,3). Their words, like those of Jesus' mother in 2,3, contain an implicit request but do not demand that Jesus act in a specific way. Jesus delayed unexpectedly for two days before going to Judea, but Martha continued to be confident that "whatever" Jesus asked from God, God would do (11,22). Her words again resemble those of Jesus' mother at Cana (cf. 2,5). Martha's faith was not preoccupied with the miraculous, since she confessed her faith before Jesus had done a miracle (11,27) and her attempt to prevent Jesus from opening the tomb suggests that she was not actually expecting a miracle (11,39). When Jesus said "if you believe you will see the glory of God", he indicated that faith is the presupposition for perceiving the significance of the miracle.

Some who saw the miracle reported Jesus to the authorities (11,46), as the invalid in chap. 5 had done. Others "believed" because of what they had seen (11,45), but by the end of chap. 12 it becomes clear that people with such faith are ultimately unable to comprehend Jesus' words (12,9-11.17-18.34). They understood Jesus in terms of their own expectations which were derived from scripture, and "though he had done so many signs before them, yet they did not believe in him" (12,37).

John 20,1-31

The theme of seeing, hearing, and believing culminates in John 20, where the evangelist juxtaposes Peter and the Beloved Disciple with Mary Magdalene (20,1-18) and the disciples as a group with Thomas (20,19-31)⁽³⁴⁾. The first two scenes are set at the empty tomb on Easter morning. Mary's discovery of the open tomb in vv. 1-2 sets the stage for the whole section, then the two main scenes unfold in similar sequences⁽³⁵⁾.

20,1-10	20,11-18
BD reaches tomb; sees cloths	Mary stoops; sees angels
Peter enters tomb; sees cloths	Mary turns; sees Jesus
BD enters tomb; sees;	Mary turns; hears her name;
and believes	and recognizes Jesus
Disciples did not yet know	Jesus tells Mary to announce
the scripture that Jesus	his ascension to "My
must rise	Father and your Father"
Disciples return	Mary returns; tells disciples
	what she saw and heard

A number of interpreters have suggested that the double references to the disciples seeing the burial cloths (20,5.6), the question "Why are you weeping?" (20,13.15), and Mary turning to Jesus (20,14.16) are redundancies which stem from an attempt to combine

⁽³⁴⁾ MŁAKUZYHIL, *Christocentric*, 117, notes the diptych character of 20,1-10.11-18, and 20,19-23.24-29. We include 20,30-31 in the diptych because it addresses those "who have not seen", who are introduced in 20,29. For discussion of alternative proposals on the structure of chap. 20 see I. DE LA POTTERIE, "Genèse de la foi pascale d'après Jn. 20", *NTS* 30 (1984) 26-49.

⁽³⁵⁾ The structural and thematic similarities suggest that 20,9 may correspond to 20,17. Jesus' resurrection is mentioned in 20,9 and his ascension mentioned in 20,17; both are part of Jesus' movement back to the Father. 20,9 states that the disciples did not yet understand the scriptural necessity for Jesus' resurrection, and in 20,17 the words "my Father and your Father" and "my God and your God" echo the scriptural covenant formula "I will be your God and you will be my people". The covenant promise was associated with the gift of God's spirit (Ezek 36,27-28; John 20,22). Together these verses suggest that it was scripturally necessary for Jesus to rise in order to fulfill God's covenant promises by giving the Spirit. The disciples would not discern this until later, however (cf. 2,22; 12,16).

disparate sources⁽³⁶⁾. Nevertheless, the repetition creates three-part dramatic sequences which climax when a character recognizes that Jesus is alive. The elements in each sequence are distinguished by body movements, like looking into the tomb, entering the tomb, and turning to Jesus. Repeated references to what was seen and said build intensity into the scene, making readers wonder when each character will grasp what has happened.

The first sequence climaxed when the Beloved Disciple "saw and believed" (20,8). The text does not specify what the disciple believed. But since the word "believe" is used absolutely, at a climactic point in the narrative, for a disciple who already was in an especially close relationship to Jesus, the text must mean that the disciple believed that Jesus was alive⁽³⁷⁾. The comment "for as yet they did not know the scripture, that he must rise from the dead" (20,9) apparently indicates that the disciples' reactions were not governed by expectations derived from scripture, unlike the others in Jerusalem who misunderstood Jesus (7,41b-42; 12,34). The disciples connected the scriptures with Jesus' resurrection only some time *after* the Easter experience (cf. 2,22; 7,37-39; 12,16). One disciple, who was already in a close relationship with Jesus, did believe when he saw the grave-cloths. But his faith, like Martha's (11,27,39), did not entail full comprehension, nor did it lead to the announcement that Jesus had risen. Moreover, nothing is said about Peter's faith, and we must assume that even though Peter "saw" the grave-cloths, he did not yet recognize that Jesus had risen.

⁽³⁶⁾ See the summary of the discussion by R. MAHONEY, *Two Disciples at the Tomb: The Background and Message of John 20.1-10* (Theologie und Wirklichkeit 6; Bern - Frankfurt 1974) 171-227. See also F. NEIRYNCK, "John and the Synoptics: The Empty Tomb Stories", *NTS* 30 (1984) 161-187.

⁽³⁷⁾ Scholars generally grant this point; exceptions are noted by BROWN, *John*, II, 987. In addition to the commentaries, see MAHONEY, *Two Disciples*, 261-270; S. SCHNEIDERS, "The Face Veil: A Johannine Sign", *BTB* 13 (1983) 94-97; B. BYRNE, "The Faith of the Beloved Disciple and the Community in John 20", *JSNT* 23 (1985) 83-97. Byrne argues that Beloved Disciple's faith was a prototype of the faith of Christians who had "not seen", since he did not actually see *Jesus* at the empty tomb. Nevertheless, the BD does differ significantly from Christians of later generations in that he was present at the tomb and did "see" the grave-cloths. DE LA POTTERIE, "Génèse", 32-33, points out that the Beloved Disciple's faith did not entail full comprehension.

Mary's story confirms that seeing alone does not guarantee faith. She saw the open tomb (20,1), the two angels (20,12), and even the risen Jesus himself (20,14), yet persisted in thinking that the body had been stolen (20,2.13.15). Only when she heard Jesus speak her name did she recognize him. What she heard enabled her to make sense of what she saw, although the command to stop touching Jesus (20,17) indicates that she did not fully comprehend the significance of the resurrection. Mary did respond to Jesus' command, however, by telling the disciples what she saw and heard (20,18). The evangelist does not say how the disciples reacted to what she said, but her words set the stage for the scenes that follow.

The last half of the chapter contrasts the responses of the disciples with that of Thomas. The passage can be divided into two scenes (20,19-25.26-31) which are set one week apart in the closed room where the disciples are gathered together. In both scenes Jesus greets the disciples with "Peace be with you" and shows them his hands and side. The main elements appear in parallel sequences and are followed by short passages stating the effect or intended effect of these events on persons who were not present.

*John 20,19-25*RESURRECTION APPEARANCE
(20,19-23)

Evening of that day
Disciples were gathered
Doors were shut
Jesus came; stood among them
Jesus: "Peace be with you"
Showed his hands and side

Disciples rejoiced
Jesus: "Peace be with you
As the Father sent me
so I send you
Receive the Holy Spirit,
forgive and retain sins"

ONE NOT PRESENT (20,24-25)

Thomas not present
when Jesus came
Disciples say they
they have seen the Lord

*John 20,26-31*RESURRECTION APPEARANCE
(20,26-29)

Eight days later
Disciples were gathered
Doors were shut
Jesus came; stood among them
Jesus: "Peace be with you"
Showed his hands and side
Jesus: "Do not be faithless"
Thomas: "My Lord and God"
Jesus:

"Have you believed because
you have seen me?
Blessed are those who
have not seen, yet believe"

THOSE NOT PRESENT (20,30-31)

Jesus did many other
signs in the presence
of the disciples
which are not written

Thomas: "Unless I see
and touch
I will not believe"

These are written
that you may believe

The disciples who were gathered in 20,19 had been prepared to recognize the risen Jesus by what they heard. First, Mary Magdalene had told them, "I have seen the Lord" (20,18). Second, the evangelist presents Jesus' actions and the disciples' reactions in ways that recall the Farewell Discourses, where Jesus promised that the disciples would receive peace (14,27; 20,19,21), joy (16,20-22; 20,20), and the Spirit (14,26; 20,22)⁽³⁸⁾. The resurrection appearance confirmed what the disciples had already heard.

Thomas, the main character in the second episode, also had heard statements that prepared him to recognize Jesus. The disciples echoed Mary by saying, "We have seen the Lord" (20,25). The evangelist also specified that Thomas had been present during the Farewell Discourses when Jesus said, "If you had known *me* you would have known *my Father* also. From now on you know him and *have seen him*" (14,5,7). When Jesus appeared, Thomas confessed that Jesus was Lord and God, reflecting what he had previously been told by the disciples (20,25) and by Jesus (14,7).

The difference between Thomas and the other characters in this chapter is that he made seeing and touching a *pre-condition* for belief, as had the skeptics in Jerusalem (2,18) and the crowd in Galilee (6,30). The previous episodes in chap. 20 showed that seeing did not guarantee believing: two disciples saw the grave-cloths, but only one believed, and he was silent about his faith; Mary saw the open tomb, angels, and the risen Jesus, but she recognized him only when she heard her name. At the same time, the evangelist did not disparage seeing. The macarism in 20,29 does not deny that the disciples who believed when they saw Jesus were blessed; it insists that those who believe without seeing *are* blessed, through a faith engendered by hearing the testimony of others⁽³⁹⁾.

The blessing of 20,29 extends the horizon of the story to readers of subsequent generations, who are addressed directly in 20,30-31. Like the Thomas of 20,24-25, the readers have not seen the empty

⁽³⁸⁾ See, e.g., BROWN, *John*, II, 1035; BARRETT, *John*, 568-569; SCHNACKENBURG, *John*, III, 323-324; DE LA POTTERIE, "Genèse", 37-38.

⁽³⁹⁾ See esp. BROWN, *John*, II, 1048-1051.

tomb or the risen Jesus, but have heard the testimony of others, and probably believe already⁽⁴⁰⁾. The signs recorded in the gospel would confirm and be received by the faith which the readers already had, that they might continue to believe.

Conclusion

Genuine faith, according to the Fourth Gospel, is engendered through hearing. Sometimes hearing leads to faith without any attendant miracle, as it did among the Samaritans. In the case of the disciples, the royal official, the blind man, and Martha, hearing evoked an initial response of faith or trusting obedience which was confirmed and deepened by a sign. Moreover, their faith enabled them rightly to perceive the sign and receive it as testimony to Jesus' claims. Not everyone who heard came to faith, and the reasons for their unbelief lie beyond the bounds of this study. Nevertheless, those who *did* manifest a genuine faith, did so after an initial experience of hearing⁽⁴¹⁾.

Those whose initial perception of Jesus was based on seeing regularly failed to come to true faith⁽⁴²⁾: bystanders showed skepticism when Jesus cleansed the temple, the invalid at Bethzatha manifested an obtuse inability to believe, and some of the Jewish leaders reacted to the signs with hostility. Other people responded to the signs with an unreliable faith, which Jesus mistrusted (2,23-25). People like Nicodemus, and the crowds in Galilee and Jerusalem interpreted Jesus in light of their own expectations and finally balked at his words (e.g., 3,9; 6,14-15.41.60; 8,59; 12,34).

⁽⁴⁰⁾ The Christian character of the intended readers of the Fourth Gospel is granted by most scholars. See, e.g., BROWN, *John*, I, LXXVII-LXXIX; DE JONGE, *Jesus*, 1-3; K. WENGST, *Bedrängte Gemeinde und verherrlichter Christus: Der historische Ort des Johannesevangeliums als Schlüssel zu seiner Interpretation* (Biblisch-Theologische Studien 5; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1983) 33-36.

⁽⁴¹⁾ SCHNIDER - STENGER, *Johannes*, 83; BOISMARD, "Rapports", 362. Cf. DE JONGE, *Jesus*, 135-136; RENGSTORF, "*sēmeion*", 252.

⁽⁴²⁾ Cf. TRAETS, *Voir Jésus*, 233. The one possible exception is Nicodemus, who claims Jesus' body for burial (19,39). If his action reveals faith (BROWN, *John*, I, 959-960), it is a faith that developed only after Nicodemus spoke of giving Jesus "a hearing" (7,51) and as a fulfillment of Jesus' own words in 12,32.

Our study does not suggest that the evangelist disparaged seeing signs, resurrection appearances, or actions like the temple cleansing. At the same time, "signs faith" cannot be understood as a first step toward genuine faith, since the characters who manifest signs faith consistently fail to move beyond it. The evangelist makes clear that Jesus' actions were rightly perceived only by those who already responded with faith or trusting obedience to what they had heard from or about Jesus. The evangelist would say that "in the beginning was the Word", which evoked responses to Jesus that were confirmed by signs, led to proper perception of signs, and could grow into genuine faith even without signs.

Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary
2481 Como Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55108 U.S.A.

Craig KOESTER

SOMMAIRE

On peut étudier le rapport que Jn établit entre voir, entendre et croire en notant comment l'évangéliste juxtapose des personnages qui représentent les différentes réponses faites à Jésus. Ceux qui manifestent une foi authentique sont ceux qui répondent avec une foi commençante ou avec une obéissance confiante suscitée par ce qu'ils entendent dire au sujet de Jésus. La réponse initiale est confirmée par des signes, elle mène à la juste perception des signes, et parfois croît jusqu'à une foi qui peut se passer de signes. Au contraire, ceux qui d'abord croient au vu de ce que Jésus fait, interprètent Jésus à partir de leurs propres attentes et finalement achoppent à ses paroles.

A Cynic Q?

In recent years a number of scholars have been canvassing the traditions about Cynics in the Greco-Roman world as important background material for interpreting various parts of the New Testament. In a number of studies, A. J. Malherbe has sought to show how much of Paul's correspondence can be seen in part as a reaction against ideas put forward by Cynics⁽¹⁾. Others too have suggested that Cynic traditions may be important for illuminating parts of the gospel tradition, in particular the Q material in the gospels. The possible parallel between the apparent garb of the Q missionaries (as reflected in the Q mission discourse) and that of Cynic preachers has been noted by P. Hoffmann and G. Theissen⁽²⁾, and Theissen has suggested that the bearers of the sayings tradition⁽³⁾ in the gospels represent a group which is at least sociologically comparable to Cynic preachers (though he avoids claiming that there was any direct link between the two groups). L. Vaage has also attempted to delineate a number of substantive parallels between Cynic traditions and the Q mission discourse in Q 10,3-12⁽⁴⁾ as well as other parts of Q

⁽¹⁾ See, for example, A. J. MALHERBE, *Paul and the Thessalonians* (Philadelphia 1987) 107: "Paul is at great pains to keep his recent converts from adopting the Cynic way of life".

⁽²⁾ P. HOFFMANN, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* (NTAbh 8; Münster 1981) 318; G. THEISSEN, "Wanderradikalismus. Literatursoziologische Aspekte der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum", *ZTK* 70 (1973) 245-271, on p. 255f. = *Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums* (WUNT 19; Tübingen 1979) 89f.; also id., "Gewaltverzicht und Feindesliebe (Mt 5,38-48/Lk 6,27-36) und deren sozialgeschichtlicher Hintergrund", *Studien*, 160-197, on pp. 189ff.

⁽³⁾ However, Theissen includes more in the "sayings tradition" than just Q.

⁽⁴⁾ In accordance with what is becoming standard convention I refer to passages in Q with the Lukan chapter and verse numbers, without of course

such as the sayings about the Kingdom and about love-of-enemies⁽⁵⁾. In a series of recent articles, G. Downing too has suggested that Cynic traditions provide an impressive number of parallels to the individual parts of the Q material⁽⁶⁾. The possible parallels between Q and Cynicism have also been used by some to support theories that the historical Jesus should be seen against this background too⁽⁷⁾.

The Cynic background has also recently been adduced by some to provide possible analogies not only for individual traditions in Q but also for the genre of Q as a whole. Both Downing and Kloppenborg have suggested that the *Lives* of Cynic philosophers (e.g. in Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of Famous Philosophers*) provide a significant parallel to Q as a whole⁽⁸⁾. Neither Downing nor Kloppenborg claims that Q is itself necessarily Cynic and indeed Kloppenborg explicitly denies this; however, Downing claims that the parallels at the levels of individual traditions and of genre are too numerous to be coincidental. The editor(s), or compiler(s), of Q must have had their audience in mind and an audience hearing (or reading) Q would have been immediately struck by these similarities; hence the choice and editing of the Q traditions may well have been

prejudging the issue of whether Matthew or Luke is more original at any one point.

⁽⁵⁾ L. F. VAAGE, *Q: The Ethos and Ethics of an Itinerant Radicalism* (Ph. D. dissertation, Claremont 1987).

⁽⁶⁾ F. G. DOWNING, "Contemporary Analogies to the Gospels and Acts: 'Genres' or 'Motifs'?", *Synoptic Studies* (ed. C. M. TUCKETT) (Sheffield 1984) 51-65 (for Q see p. 58) [= "Analogies"]; "Cynics and Christians", *NTS* 30 (1984) 584-593 (for Q pp. 586-589) [= "Cynics"]; "Ears to Hear", *Alternative Approaches to New Testament Study* (ed. A. E. HARVEY) (London 1985) 97-121 (for Q pp. 106f.) [= "Ears"]; "The Social Contexts of Jesus the Teacher: Construction and Reconstruction", *NTS* 33 (1987) 439-451 [= "Social Contexts"]; "Quite like Q: A Genre for 'Q': The 'Lives' of the Cynic Philosophers", *Bib* 69 (1988) 196-225 [= "Quite like Q"]. Much of his evidence is now given in full in his *Christ and the Cynics* (Sheffield 1988).

⁽⁷⁾ See DOWNING, *Jesus and the Threat of Freedom* (London 1987), as well as "Social Contexts", *passim*. Cf. too B. MACK, *A Myth of Innocence* (Philadelphia 1988) especially 67-69.

⁽⁸⁾ See J. S. KLOPPENBORG, *The Formation of Q* (Philadelphia 1987) esp. 306-325; DOWNING, "Quite like Q", *passim*.

deliberately undertaken in order to cultivate such an impression⁽⁹⁾. Thus:

There is enough common ground, sufficient signs of agreed common meaning, for it to have been very likely that the people who produced 'Q' would have been aware of and (instinctively) used the model of the *Life* of a Cynic Philosopher in composing their collection of the sayings of Jesus⁽¹⁰⁾.

In view of the contemporary interest in Q and its possibly distinctive ideology, the question of the relevance of the Cynic material for Q study deserves careful study. Further, in order to keep the discussion within manageable limits, attention will here be confined to Q: problems about the historical Jesus or the Pauline epistles will be considered only in passing. However, the parallels between Q and Cynic traditions made by some in the recent debate do raise a number of critical problems. There are first some general problems of definition, date and provenance.

Definition. There is a tendency by some to refer to many traditions assumed to be "Cynic" with appeal being made to a very wide range of authors for evidence. (This applies especially in the work of Downing and Vaage.) Nobody would dispute that some of this evidence is "Cynic" in some sense at least: for example, Epictetus writing about the (ideal) Cynic (III. xxii), Diogenes Laertius writing his *Lives of Cynics* such as Diogenes (in Book VI of his *Lives*), Lucian's *Life of Demonax*, some of Dio Chrysostom's *Orations*, and the Cynic Epistles. However, other authors not usually regarded as Cynics are also often cited. These include the Stoics Musonius Rufus and Seneca, the life of Socrates in Diogenes Laertius II, and Epictetus outside III. xxii. All of Dio's writings are sometimes referred to very freely.

The relationship between Cynicism and Stoicism is a complex one. The earliest Cynics (Antisthenes, Diogenes, Crates) pre-date the rise of Stoicism (founded by Zeno, the pupil of Crates). To a certain extent Stoicism grew out of Cynicism, so that many Stoics appealed to Cynic figures of the past very positively. However,

⁽⁹⁾ Downing frequently refers to the importance of audience reaction in assessing the significance of the Cynic parallels: cf. "Analogies", 58; "Ears", 106; "Cynics", 590; "Quite like Q", 218f.; *Christ and the Cynics*, vii-ix.

⁽¹⁰⁾ "Quite like Q", 222.

the two movements cannot necessarily be identified⁽¹¹⁾. What was important for Cynics was, above all, practice of the simple life, with philosophising given a fairly low priority. Stoicism on the other hand added a theoretical superstructure to Cynic practices and in many instances modified those practices considerably. The Cynic stress on the importance of practice is reflected in the often-made claim that the Cynic way of life was a short-cut to happiness (i.e. by by-passing philosophy: cf. Ps. Crates 13, 16) and in Diogenes Laertius' observation that many regarded Cynicism as not so much a philosophy and more a way of life (VI. 103). Cynics could thus be quite eclectic in their comments and "teachings": "what made a Cynic was his dress and conduct, self-sufficiency, harsh behaviour towards what appeared as excesses, and a practical ethical idealism"⁽¹²⁾. One should therefore beware of equating Cynicism and Stoicism⁽¹³⁾.

Even within the Cynic movement itself, it is clear that there was a very wide variety of thought permitted, and Malherbe has pointed to substantial differences between a very rigorous, ascetic form of Cynicism and milder forms⁽¹⁴⁾; indeed some of the Cynic epistles may well reflect these differences of opinion amongst Cynics themselves. Further, one should probably distinguish between "real" Cynics (as reflected, for example, in the writers of the Cynic Epistles) and the highly stylised and idealised presentation of the ideal Cynic by Epictetus in III. xxii which may reflect as much Epictetus' Stoicism as it does genuine Cynicism. In any case, Diogenes Laertius' observation, noted above, about Cynicism as primarily a way of life suggests how hard it may be to isolate

⁽¹¹⁾ See especially A. J. MALHERBE, "Pseudo-Heraclitus Epistle 4: The Divinisation of the Wise Man", *JAC* 21 (1978) 42-64.

⁽¹²⁾ MALHERBE, "Self-Definition among Epicureans and Cynics", *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition Vol. 3: Self-Definition in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. B. F. MEYER - E. P. SANDERS) (Philadelphia 1982) 46-59, on p. 49.

⁽¹³⁾ One should therefore perhaps avoid terms like "Cynic-Stoic" in the present discussion.

⁽¹⁴⁾ See his article "Cynics", *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 201-203, his Introduction to his edition of *The Cynic Epistles* (Missoula 1977) 1, and his "Self-Definition", *passim*.

any "ideas" which one can confidently assert as being "Cynic" ⁽¹⁵⁾.

In the light of this, the very wide range of authors referred to by some as "Cynic" becomes rather problematic. Is it justified to cite Epictetus on Cynics, Dio, the Cynic Epistles, Demonax and Diogenes almost indiscriminately when such texts display such a wide variety of underlying presuppositions? It is even more problematic if authors such as Musonius Rufus, Seneca, or Epictetus *outside* III. xxii are cited as evidence of the "Cynic" background when these writers are usually regarded as Stoic rather than Cynic. There is, for example, no evidence that Epictetus or Seneca explicitly adopted the role of a Cynic wandering preacher ⁽¹⁶⁾. It is also not entirely clear when it is justifiable to cite the evidence of Dio ⁽¹⁷⁾.

Downing is certainly aware of these difficulties and has sought to answer the problems raised ⁽¹⁸⁾. For example, he defends the use of a very wide range of sources in general terms by claiming that "first century Cynicism [was] a movement of considerable diversity but still exhibiting a family resemblance" ⁽¹⁹⁾. This though raises the question of how far one can legitimately regard the ideas and

⁽¹⁵⁾ For the diversity within Cynicism, cf. MALHERBE, "Self-Definition", 49f.; "Pseudo-Heraclitus", 48; see too D. B. DUDLEY, *A History of Cynicism* (London 1937) 37; W. A. MEEKS, *The Moral World of the First Christians* (London 1987) 53. Cf. too H. W. ATTRIDGE, "The Philosophical Critique of Religion under the Empire", *ANRW* II. 16. 1, 45-78, on p. 56: amongst Cynics there was "little, if any, doctrinal concern, and hence little consistency in their attitude toward religious belief and observation".

⁽¹⁶⁾ See S. K. STOWERS, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (SBLDS 57; Chico 1981) 53ff., who shows that Epictetus and others were not street preachers, but teachers in a "school" situation.

⁽¹⁷⁾ It would appear that Orations 6, 8, 9, 10 reflect the time of Dio's vagrant life in the style of a Cynic preacher: cf. DUDLEY, *History*, 151, referring to the work of VON ARNIM, *Leben und Werke des Dion von Prusa* (1898).

⁽¹⁸⁾ The issue is not really discussed by Vaage, who only deals with the question of whether there is really as great a variety within genuine Cynicism as Malherbe claims.

⁽¹⁹⁾ "Cynics", 584f.: he claims that it is legitimate to use, in addition to the Cynic epistles, "Diogenes Laertius on the on-going Diogenes tradition, Dio of Prusa at least at the points where he claims Diogenes of Sinope, Epictetus and his mentor Musonius Rufus . . . Material may also be drawn from Seneca (so long as it has support from other sources) and from Plutarch on Diogenes".

statements expressed by this variety of writers as peculiarly *Cynic*. The large number of parallels in contemporary literature may simply show that Cynics shared things in common with a broader cross-section of their society. Rather than showing that Epictetus et al. were in fact Cynics, the "family resemblance" may simply show that "real" Cynics were not in fact so independent of their contemporary environment as they may have liked to think!

Elsewhere Downing has again responded to this issue, and says:

We are concerned with *Lives* and with ideas that are presented as Cynic and seem to have been popularly perceived as Cynic, even though there may well be evidence for Cynic thinkers who as individuals had reached a much more distinctive and 'unStoic' Cynicism⁽²⁰⁾.

This does not however answer all the problems raised. Where is the evidence that the writings of Stoics such as Seneca, or Epictetus (outside III. xxii) or Musonius Rufus were either "presented as Cynic" or "popularly perceived as Cynic"? Downing's appeals to these writers certainly go far beyond the points where they are explicitly presenting the views of other Cynics, e.g. Seneca re-presenting the views of Demetrius, or Epictetus giving the picture of the ideal Cynic. Further, as noted above, neither Seneca nor Epictetus appears to have adopted the role of a Cynic wandering preacher, so it is unclear how far their writings would have been "perceived as Cynic". The large number of references to almost all of Dio's writings also creates problems. Did Dio regard himself as always a Cynic? Was he regarded by others as always a Cynic? As noted above (see n. 17) some of his Orations stem from his period of exile when he took on the Cynic garb and spoke of Diogenes. Yet this was only one period of his life and subsequently Dio returned from exile. Further, when Dio does talk of some "Cynic" preachers in Alexandria (Dio 32.9) he seems to regard them as a group to which he himself does *not* belong. Dio may not have objected to some of the things they said (which may only show that many of the things said by Cynics were not that special and not peculiarly Cynic: cf. above), but their behaviour made the task of a "true philosopher" in gaining a hearing all the more difficult.

⁽²⁰⁾ "Quite like Q", 204f. and n. 25.

There is thus a real danger, if one is not careful, of the boundaries of so-called "Cynic" teaching being extended so far that it becomes no longer meaningful to speak of what is included within the limits as in any sense a unity, let alone something that would be recognised by someone else at the time as peculiarly "Cynic".

Date. Similar problems are raised by the date of the Cynic evidence. Much uncertainty surrounds the date of the Cynic epistles, and they can be variously dated to a period roughly contemporary with the start of the Christian movement. As such they may be usable as evidence for possible 1st-century Cynic views. Much of the other evidence for Cynic views is however rather late if it is to be used as background material for illuminating Q (and the same applies with even more force if one is considering the possible background of Jesus). Diogenes Laertius' *Lives* are usually dated to the early 3rd century AD. No doubt Laertius may have used prior sources⁽²¹⁾. Nevertheless there are still problems as to whether it is legitimate to use a 3rd-century text to provide information about the thought-world of a 1st-century society. Similar problems arise in the case of Dio and Epictetus. Dio appears to have adopted the Cynic way of life only after his banishment from Rome in 82 AD. Epictetus lived from c. 55-135 AD. How far is it legitimate to use the writings of someone at the end of the 1st century to illuminate middle 1st-century, or even early 1st-century, Christianity? This problem becomes even more pressing if one accepts the view (assumed by most ancient historians) that Cynicism faded away very considerably in the 2nd and 1st century BC but revived in importance in the 1st century AD⁽²²⁾. Yet the question remains: how early in the 1st century? Demetrius seems to be the earliest Cynic we know of in this revival: however, Demetrius was exiled under Nero in c. 66 AD and hence cannot be dated much earlier than the middle of the 1st century. Cynics may well have been around earlier⁽²³⁾; but they do not appear to have had a great deal of influence or to have made a great impact on the public consciousness. It may be therefore that the era of the very

(21) Cf. Hicks' introduction to the Loeb edition of Diogenes Laertius, p. xxiii.

(22) Cf. DUDLEY, *History* and many others.

(23) So DUDLEY, *History*, 117-124.

articulate defenders of Cynicism (such as Dio or Epictetus) does not start until relatively late in the 1st century.

Questions of date are often adduced in the vexed problem of the possible influence of Gnosticism on NT Christianity. Many too would regard it as inappropriate to use the social background presupposed in the Pastoral epistles (written probably in the late 1st century) as legitimate background material for early Christian texts. Perhaps the problem of the relative dating of the Cynic texts needs more detailed consideration than it has received in the past, and more care taken to distinguish between earlier tradition (e.g. the Cynic epistles, or passages in later texts such as Diogenes Laertius which are paralleled elsewhere) and traditions which only appear in later texts.

Provenance. More problems arise if one considers the question of whether Cynicism permeated the society from which Q emanated (or even the society of Jesus). The geographical Sitz im Leben of Q is much debated, though most would place its setting somewhere in Galilee or the environs. (Jesus is certainly to be placed in Galilee!) So too most would agree that the Christian group which preserved Q was in some kind of relationship (however hostile) with Judaism. Is it then reasonable to think of Cynic preachers, and Cynic ideas, as present in such a situation?

Theissen has referred to the existence of Menippus, Meleager and Oenomaus in Gadara as evidence of Cynic presence there at various times over a period of 500 years⁽²⁴⁾. Downing also refers to the evidence of Dio: Dio had travelled widely and is said to have found people claiming to be Cynics "on every street corner in a city like Alexandria" (with reference to Dio 32.9)⁽²⁵⁾. Downing also re-

⁽²⁴⁾ *Studien*, 90.

⁽²⁵⁾ "Social Contexts", 449 referring to "Cynics", 584 with reference to Dio 32.9 and his wide travels (cf. 1.50f.; 13.9-11. These latter references only speak of Dio's own wide travels; they do not mention any encounter with other Cynics). In "Quite like Q", 220, Downing again cites Dio 32.9 as saying that Cynics can be found on "every street corner". Much the same evidence is cited in *Christ and the Cynics*, 3. Downing also refers to MALHERBE, *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Handbook* (Philadelphia 1986) 13, as supporting his use of the text in Dio 32.9. However, Malherbe here makes no explicit reference to Dio, or to Cynics in contrast to others: he refers only to the widespread phenomenon of philosophical teachers in general.

fers to Dio's claim that the masses remembered much about Diogenes (Dio 72.11)⁽²⁶⁾.

However, Theissen's trio of Cynics in Gadara span the 1st century in time, but none of them actually dates from the 1st century itself; there is thus still the problem of dating mentioned above. The evidence of Dio is also of somewhat uncertain value. Dio 32.9 says slightly less than Downing suggests. The presence of Cynics on "every" street corner in "a city like" Alexandria may read more into Dio's text than is justified. Dio certainly says that there was quite a number of such people (πλήθος οὐκ ὀλίγον). But he simply says that they are on the street corners and in the temple gateways, not on "every" street corner; and Dio is talking here only of Alexandria, not of any other city like Alexandria. It is thus not clear that we can generalize from this statement of Dio's to conclude that Cynics were prevalent everywhere in the Empire wherever Dio went. Further, it is quite clear that Dio wants to distinguish himself from such people⁽²⁷⁾.

Downing sees further support for the theory of the wide geographical spread of Cynic influence in Epictetus' insistence that "a Cynic has 'all humankind' for his sphere of work, and public places are where they are to be met"⁽²⁸⁾. But this says only that Cynics spoke in public places; it does not imply anything about their geographical spread across the Empire. Similar appeals to the Cynic epistles are equally inconclusive⁽²⁹⁾. Ps. Crates 21.1 only refers to "the masses" (οἱ πολλοί) who flee Cynic preachers when they see how hard the going is. Ps. Crates 31 says, "Seek wise men, even if you have to go to the ends of the earth". But it is hard to deduce very much about the spread of Cynicism from such a hyperbolic reference⁽³⁰⁾. Ps. Diogenes 6.2 simply exhorts the Cynic teacher to go to the market place; and Ps. Diogenes 12.1 again refers to the response of the "masses". All this simply shows that Cynics preached in public

⁽²⁶⁾ "Quite like Q", 220. But is this quite the same as saying that Cynic preachers were around?

⁽²⁷⁾ Cf. A. J. MALHERBE, "'Gentle as a Nurse': The Cynic Background to 1 Thess. II", *NT* 12 (1970) 203-217.

⁽²⁸⁾ "Quite like Q", 220, referring to Epictetus III. xxii. 26; xxiii. 24; IV. iv. 26f.

⁽²⁹⁾ "Quite like Q", 221.

⁽³⁰⁾ Cf. the comparable problems in interpreting the similar phrase in 1 Clem 5.

places to the "masses"; but it says nothing about how widespread geographically the phenomenon was.

The above references do indicate what is anyway widely accepted by many today: namely that Cynicism was primarily an *urban* phenomenon⁽³¹⁾, with Cynic preachers addressing crowds in the great centres of population. Downing too has appealed to the existence of Sepphoris, Herod Agrippa's "thriving Hellenistic capital city" 6 km from Nazareth, as supporting the likelihood of Cynic influence in the geographical environment of Jesus⁽³²⁾. Yet such Hellenistic centres are striking by the absence of any mention of them in the gospels (and hence in Q). So too many would regard Q as emanating from a rural setting, rather than an urban one⁽³³⁾. Clearly one cannot draw hard and fast lines between "rural" and "urban". Nevertheless, the geographical references which occur in the gospels (and Q), including only relatively small towns and villages in Galilee such as Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum, would appear to make the theory of Cynic influence rather less probable⁽³⁴⁾.

(31) See DUDLEY, *History*, 143; cf. too R. URO, *Sheep among Wolves* (Helsinki 1987) 124; MEEKS, *Moral World*, 55.

(32) "Social Contexts", 449; *Christ and the Cynics*, x, 6.

(33) Cf. the theories of Theissen who has made much of the social distinction between the rural Palestinian movement and the urban Hellenistic groups (in the Pauline communities) as underlying some of the differences which arose in the Pauline churches, especially in Corinth. See too URO, *Sheep*, 124.

(34) Downing has also appealed to evidence from Josephus to support the theory of a significant Cynic presence in Palestine: he claims that Josephus' references to Judas the Galilean's movement as the "fourth philosophy" are intended to identify the movement as Cynic and the same applies to Josephus' accounts of John the Baptist whom Josephus associates with Judas. (See "Cynics", 585, 590f.; "Analogies", 58; "Social Contexts", 449, with reference to *Ant.* XVIII. 4-10, 23-25, 116-9, *War* II. 118.) This however fails to convince. Josephus' account of John the Baptist is probably irrelevant here since Josephus makes no explicit link between John and the "fourth philosophy". Josephus' references to Judas' movement itself as a "fourth philosophy" (which in fact Josephus makes only in his later *Antiquities*: in the earlier *War* he does not credit Judas with leading a "philosophy" at all) is left imprecise. There is no explicit reference by Josephus to Cynicism and indeed it is hard to see how Judas' movement and Cynics could be seen as related in any but the most superficial way. It is true that both could be regarded as subversive of "civilised" society. However, any further similari-

Genre of Q. As already noted, the possible connection between Q and Cynic traditions at the level of genre has been mooted in recent discussions by Downing and Kloppenborg.

The whole concept of the genre of a text is notoriously difficult to quantify and the problem of "genre" has given rise to a great deal of debate within literary criticism generally. One may, for example, think of a genre as a given classification chosen by a writer seeking to produce a specific text within that classification (genre as "prescriptive"); one may think of a genre as a broad classification made by subsequent readers of a group of texts which appear to have sufficient similarities to make it meaningful to consider them together (genre as "descriptive"). One may also think of genre as exercising an interpretative role, so that genre provides a "context of expectation" which enables us to interpret any individual parts of a given text⁽³⁵⁾. Clearly all these roles can overlap. Further, the problem of the genre of a text cannot be considered without taking note of the contents of the text. A text is made up, at least at one level, of the sum of its parts and a text does not exist independently of its constituent parts. Nevertheless, most would agree that the genre of a text concerns aspects of the text in question which involve more than just a consideration of its individual parts. Genre concerns a text considered as a totality, as a whole. Thus the ways in which the individual parts of a text are combined to form the finished product affect the genre and hence have a bearing on the interpretation of the whole.

ties are non-existent. The ethos of Judas, to serve one God alone and to rid the Jewish nation from Roman occupation, has nothing in common with Cynic concerns attacking conventional mores. Conversely there is no evidence of Cynics organizing themselves into politically active groupings bent on armed revolt against Roman troops (cf. DUDLEY, *History*, xi). Any identification by Josephus of Jewish movements in Palestine with philosophical movements in the Greco-Roman world is in any case most probably to be seen as part of his apologetic aim in writing and does not necessarily have any basis in historical reality.

⁽³⁵⁾ For the general problem of genre, see the valuable discussion of R. GUELICH, "The Gospel Genre", *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien* (ed. P. STUHLMACHER) (Tübingen 1983) 183f., with other literature cited. The phrase "context of expectation" is that of F. KERMODE, *The Genesis of Secrecy* (Cambridge, Mass. 1979) 162; cf. also E. D. HIRSCH, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven 1967) 86.

In his discussion of the genre of Q, Downing lays particular stress on the importance of audience reaction (cf. n. 9 above) and hence appears to focus on genre as descriptive: he would claim that an audience or readership, hearing/reading Q, would be inclined to deduce that this text was similar in kind to a "Life" of a Cynic philosopher. Clearly at this level, the *content* of the relevant texts becomes an important issue, especially if genre is going to function as in any way a "context of expectation" for interpreting a text: if Q is to be regarded as similar to the Life of a Cynic philosopher, then the contents of Q must bear some recognizable similarities with the contents of Cynic "Lives". And indeed it is at this level that Downing devotes the most attention in seeking to establish his thesis, trying to establish many parallels between individual traditions in Q and in Cynic traditions.

Kloppenborg's theory is similar in part. He claims that in many respects the tone and the setting of Q in something like its final form⁽³⁶⁾ "falls within the parameters of other chriic collections, especially those current in Cynic circles"⁽³⁷⁾. Kloppenborg too thus sees some similarities between the individual parts of Q and Cynic traditions at the level of content: both contain radical ethical teaching couched in polemical and confrontational anecdotes. Kloppenborg does not attempt to delineate a detailed series of similarities between Q and Cynic traditions, and indeed he denies that Q itself is Cynic. Nevertheless, the similarities in content remain; further, Q and the Cynic Lives can be regarded as collections of chreiai — hence his claim of a generic similarity between Q and the Cynic Lives as "Chreiai Collections"⁽³⁸⁾.

⁽³⁶⁾ Kloppenborg's claim about the genre of Q is connected with his own theories about the growth of Q: the Cynic parallels relate to his postulated stage in the development of Q whereby a series of wisdom-type admonitions had been expanded by judgement sayings; but the final form of Q (with the Temptation story) had not yet been reached. It is perhaps also worth noting that Kloppenborg and Vaage are somewhat at variance in this respect: for Kloppenborg the Cynic material provides a parallel to a late stage in the development of Q; for Vaage, it is the earlier strand in the mission discourse which is closely parallel to Cynic ideas.

⁽³⁷⁾ *Formation*, 324.

⁽³⁸⁾ One should however also note that, for Kloppenborg, the Cynic Lives are not the only example of Chreiai collections: the latter form a wider group of which the Cynic traditions form a part.

Now we have already seen that the "genre" of a text is usually thought of as involving rather more than just a consideration of its individual component parts considered separately. Such contents are important; but a text is usually considered as more than *just* the sum of its parts. The ways in which a text is structured, the ways in which the individual parts are put together to form a whole, the choice and ordering of material within a text, a consideration of what is *not* included in a text, all contribute to one's interpretation of the text as a whole and hence to an understanding of its genre. Thus even if the existence of a large number of substantive parallels between Q and Cynic teachings could be established, this does not necessarily prove that there is a *generic* similarity between Q and the Cynic "Lives".

At this broader level, Kloppenborg and Downing diverge somewhat. Downing argues that, although the Cynic "Lives" are cast in the form of series of chreiai, Q seems to have very few chreiai (on a strict definition of a chreia); nevertheless there was considerable fluidity in Cynic traditions between chreiai, apophthegms and gnomic sayings and so Q's lack of chreiai may not be significant⁽³⁹⁾. Kloppenborg, on the other hand, argues that Q is to be regarded as a collection of chreiai. Kloppenborg is perhaps working with a rather broader definition of a "chreia" than Downing and the difference between them is, at one level, simply a matter of terminology. But whether or not the individual units in Q can appropriately be called chreiai or not, there is still the issue of how far the Cynic Lives provide a genuine *generic* parallel to Q *as a whole*. The consideration of the forms of the individual component parts of Q or the Cynic Lives does not exhaust the generic question. At this level, Downing seems only to say that the Lives offer a relatively form-less collection of almost unrelated sayings linked by occasional thematic or catchword connections; and in this respect Q is very similar⁽⁴⁰⁾. Kloppenborg too agrees with this assessment of the Cynic Lives⁽⁴¹⁾ and sees enough similarities in the structure of Q to suggest a generic link.

⁽³⁹⁾ "Quite like Q", 199f.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ "Quite like Q", 202. Cf. also p. 200: "Both they [Lives] and 'Q' appear as collections of items, *pericopai*, with no narrative or other overall structure".

⁽⁴¹⁾ Cf. *Formation*, 310f.

Yet such an evaluation of the evidence of Q remains valid only in the most general of terms. To say that "once the account [in Q] has got under way there is ... no overall structure to the work"⁽⁴²⁾ rather begs the question of the structure of Q and would go against the trend of much recent Q study which would claim to find quite a great deal of structuring in Q. Certainly the Q discourses (e.g. the mission charge, the woes against the lawyers and/or the Pharisees, or the eschatological discourse in Q 17,22-37) constitute series of interconnected sayings which are far longer than anything to be found in the Cynic Lives. D. Catchpole has argued persuasively for a common and deep-seated structuring arrangement in the series of sayings about Cares (Q 12,22-31) and in the Love of Enemies complex (Q 6,27-36)⁽⁴³⁾. So too R. Piper has shown that several of the smaller collections of wisdom-type aphorisms in Q display evidence of a common structuring pattern⁽⁴⁴⁾. Thus even Kloppenborg seems forced in the end to modify his conclusions very considerably:

When seen in the context of chriae collections, Q ranks with the most highly organized and structured of them ... Q is very far from being a 'random collection of sayings' and is erroneously regarded as a pure sedimentation of oral tradition. It is, on the contrary, a carefully constructed composition which employs literary techniques characteristic of ancient sayings collections. In fact, in terms of its internal structure, it ranks somewhat higher than works such as *Demonax* and the Diogenes chriae, and closer in level of organisation (though not in type of organisation) to *'Abot'*⁽⁴⁵⁾.

Even this more nuanced view seems to force the evidence somewhat. Kloppenborg gives no real examples of organising principles in the materials about Diogenes or Demonax which come near the (at times) tightly structured arrangement in Q. Nor is there much comparable in m. 'Abot. It is hard to envisage how anyone hearing or reading the series of brief, loosely appended chreiai about Diogenes in Diogenes Laertius VI and the series of woes in Q 11,37-51, or the mission discourse in Q 10,2-16, would conceive of these as coming from documents of the same genre. In terms of an abstract,

⁽⁴²⁾ DOWNING, "Quite like Q", 202.

⁽⁴³⁾ D. R. CATCHPOLE, "The Ravens, the Lilies and the Q Hypothesis", *SNTU* 6/7 (1981-2) 77-87; also "Jesus and the Community of Israel — The Inaugural Discourse in Q", *BJRL* 68 (1986) 296-316.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ R. A. PIPER, *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition* (Cambridge 1989) passim.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ *Formation*, 323f.

modern idea of a genre of "chreia collections", Q could (just) be seen as belonging within such a genre and hence not *sui generis*. (This seems to be the thrust of Kloppenborg's thesis.) But in terms of audience reaction, Q and the Cynic Lives do not seem close enough for contemporary hearers/readers to have been immediately struck by their *literary* similarities.

Downing also refers to the way in which Diogenes Laertius links up each Cynic teacher with a predecessor (Antisthenes with Socrates, Diogenes with Antisthenes, Monimus with Diogenes etc.) as providing a parallel to Q's linking of Jesus with John the Baptist⁽⁴⁶⁾. The parallel is however not very convincing when examined closely. In formal terms the way in which the relationship is stated differs. In the Cynic Lives it is simply stated that X was a pupil of, or had some contact with, Y and then the exploits and sayings of X are recounted. In Q, where the main figure is Jesus, nothing is said to the effect that Jesus was a pupil of John's. Rather, Q starts with a long section devoted to John's own preaching (Q 3,7-9.16) in its own right, and the proper relationship of John to Jesus is discussed at some length later (7,18-28). But no Cynic life of Diogenes starts with a section giving Antisthenes' preaching and then has a long discussion of how Antisthenes is almost (but not quite) as important a figure as Diogenes himself. In Cynicism, the line of succession is clearly important in tracing the "genealogies" of Cynic teachers *back* to the great founding figures of the movement in the past, be it Diogenes, Antisthenes or Socrates. In Q the importance of the link between John and Jesus is presumably that John points *forward* to Jesus. It is John who receives his legitimation from Jesus and there is no suggestion in Q that the relationship between the two is the other way round. This alleged parallel between Q and the Cynic lives is thus not very persuasive.

There are also striking *differences* between the Cynic Lives and Q at the level of contents. Diogenes Laertius begins each of his Lives with a small piece of biographical information. For example:

Antisthenes, the son of Antisthenes, was an Athenian. It was said, however, that he was not of pure Attic blood . . . His mother was supposed to be a Thracian (VI. 1).

(46) "Quite like Q", 201.

Diogenes was a native of Sinope, son of Hicesius, a banker (VI. 20).

Monimus of Syracuse was a pupil of Diogenes; and, according to Socrates, he was in the service of a certain Corinthian banker (VI. 82).

Lucian's *Demonax* is similar:

He was a Cypriot by birth and not of common stock as regards civic rank and property [with then further details about his education] (*Demonax* 3).

Diogenes Laertius also ends each life by listing all the books each philosopher had written and (sometimes) telling how they died. All this has no parallel in Q: there is no "biographical" information about Jesus or John at the start of Q and, notoriously, Q gives no account of the death of Jesus (or of John)⁽⁴⁷⁾.

In terms of the structure and arrangement of the texts, there are thus significant differences between Q and the Cynic Lives. At one level the contents also differ in that some important elements of the Cynic Lives do not reappear in Q. However, as already noted, a major part of the argument for a generic similarity between Q and the Cynic Lives concerns the substantive similarities between the materials which have been included in Q and those in the Cynic Lives. Further, it is clear that, although the genre of a text involves more than the contents of each part of the text considered separately, such contents do form a vitally important role in the proper understanding of a text and its genre. We therefore turn to a consideration of the contents of Q and of the possible parallels with Cynic traditions which have been proposed.

Contents of Q. Considerations of space preclude a full discussion of every alleged parallel between Q and Cynic traditions which has been noted in the past by others. Downing and Vaage both claim to have discovered a large number of such parallels and others have pointed to more general similarities. However, a detailed analysis suggests that perhaps one should be more cautious.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ DOWNING, "Quite like Q", 203, points out that some of the smaller Lives in Diogenes Laertius do not mention the philosopher's death; nor does Dio in Dio 8. But Dio 8 is not necessarily a "life" in quite the same way as the "lives" of Diogenes Laertius; it is also unclear how far the shorter "lives" in Diogenes Laertius should be thought of as independent literary texts able to exist independently.

In a few cases the alleged parallel may not involve Q material at all. The parallel drawn between Dio's Diogenes who asserts that God feeds "with knowledge and truth" (Dio 4.41) and Jesus in the Temptation narrative who says that God feeds with his word only applies to the longer Matthean version here⁽⁴⁸⁾. Most would agree that the longer Matthean version here is MattR and not Q⁽⁴⁹⁾. In any case, the authority appealed to in Q is not a Cynic insight but quite specifically OT scripture. So too possible parallels in Cynic traditions regarding the "Two Ways" may not be relevant to the present discussion, since once again the Matthean version of the Q tradition, which alone refers to "two" ways, is widely regarded as MattR⁽⁵⁰⁾.

Conversely, as already noted, the validity of references sometimes given of allegedly "Cynic" parallels is at times doubtful. Texts cited appear to be not always clearly Cynic. Writers like Epictetus, Seneca and Musonius Rufus cannot be cited as clear evidence of "Cynic" views. Often texts from these writers simply supplement other references which are more clearly from Cynic traditions. (However, this must then raise some questions about how far such ideas can really be thought of as peculiarly "Cynic", or indeed how far anyone in the first century would have thought of them as Cynic.) Sometimes, however, the genuinely Cynic references seem rather unconvincing. In allegedly Cynic parallels to the Golden Rule (Q 6,31), Downing cites Ps. Diogenes 38.4, Epictetus I. xix. 13, Seneca

⁽⁴⁸⁾ DOWNING, "Quite like Q", 207. Further parallels cited in *Christ and the Cynics*, 17, seem less close, being mostly exhortations to reduce dependence on physical needs: cf. Ps. Crates 11. This might be parallel to Q's "Man shall not live by bread alone", though on this see the discussion of Q 12,22-31 below.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Cf. P. HOFFMANN, "Die Versuchungsgeschichte in der Logienquelle", *BZ* 13 (1969) 207-223, on p. 208; S. SCHULZ, *Q — Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich 1972) 179; U. LUZ, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 1-7)* (EKKNT; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1985) p. 159f.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ "Quite like Q", 217. For Matthew as redactional here, see A. DEN-AUX, "Der Spruch von der zwei Wegen im Rahmen des Epilogs der Bergpredigt", *LOGIA. Les Paroles de Jésus — The Sayings of Jesus* (ed. J. DELOBEL) (BETL 59; Leuven 1982) 316ff.; LUZ, *Matthäus*, 396 and several others. In any case the motif of the "two ways" was extremely widespread in antiquity (cf. LUZ, *ibid.*) and cannot easily be regarded as distinctively Cynic.

ep. mor. 9.6; 88.30; 95.63; 103.3-4⁽⁵¹⁾. But Ps. Diogenes 38.4 is scarcely comparable ("I thought it improper to take something from a person who had himself not received anything": the ethos is one of general fairness, not do-as-you-would-be-done-by). And the other texts appear to be from Stoics.

The "Cynic" parallels to "loving one's enemies" adduced by Downing also include a large number of references which would appear to be again not clearly Cynic⁽⁵²⁾. The often-cited parallel from Epictetus' description in III. xxii. 53f. about the duties of a Cynic to love those who are beating him may provide a genuine parallel to the gospel tradition (though see below); on the other hand, Diogenes is often portrayed as very far from exhibiting such a generous attitude to his "enemies"! It may be therefore that Epictetus' description is no more than an ideal which he (as a Stoic) would wish to see in Cynics. Many other Cynics were considerably less loving; hence it is rather problematic whether any audience hearing an exhortation from a Christian preacher to "love one's enemies" would have connected this in any way with a Cynic ethos⁽⁵³⁾.

Vaage's discussion of this Q passage seems also unpersuasive⁽⁵⁴⁾. He claims that the Q command to "love your enemies" is entirely *self-centred*. In a situation of indigent poverty, the attitude of love-of-enemy, defined in the following commands about non-retaliation, and giving and lending, simply reflect the way in which beggars survive in a hostile environment. However, Vaage's refusal to interpret the meaning of "love" on its own, seeing it as defined

(⁵¹) "Quite like Q", 209 and n. 47 (in *Christ and the Cynics*, 27, he adds Dio 17.8 which is perhaps a closer parallel). Downing concedes that the Rule is not peculiar to Cynics. But his claim that "the attitude it [the Rule] articulates is implicit in the pervasive insistence on harmonising deeds and words" seems rather unconvincing. The Rule is not about harmonising deeds and words; it is about conforming one's deeds to what one hopes for from others.

(⁵²) "Quite like Q", 208 and nn. 41-43, also *Christ and the Cynics*, 23-25, referring to Musonius 10, Diogenes Laertius II. 21 (on Socrates, though this is really only about Socrates' patience), II. 35-37 (though this only really concerns non-retaliation) and several texts in Epictetus and Seneca.

(⁵³) There are too parallels to such sentiments elsewhere in contemporary literature, notably in Jewish wisdom literature as well as in other strands of popular Hellenistic philosophy besides Cynicism (cf. KLOPPENBORG, *Formation*, 179).

(⁵⁴) VAAGE, *Q*, 402-430.

solely in the following commands, seems unjustified. In any case the injunction to lend to others, without expecting repayment, surely implies a different *Sitz im Leben* from that of beggars (who are lent to, but do not lend)⁽⁵⁵⁾. The language of "mercy" (Q 6,36) and regard for *others* in lending, not just self-regard, surely distinguishes Q's "love of enemies" from the Cynic ethos of self-preservation outlined by Vaage. Indeed the underlying ethos may also be rather different from that of Seneca or Epictetus who use much of the same language about being kind to enemies, but who seem to regard such an attitude as essentially *self-regarding* and a way of asserting one's own superiority in being serenely imperturbable⁽⁵⁶⁾.

One of the most striking apparent agreements between Q and Cynicism concerns the Q mission charge. The parallel between the instructions given to the Q missionaries concerning their dress (Q 10,4) and the garb adopted by Cynic preachers has long been noted. However, when one looks at the texts in detail, the parallel may not have the significance which others see here. Many have pointed out that the *distinguishing marks* of the Cynic were the *πήρα*, the staff and the cloak⁽⁵⁷⁾. However, for the Q missionaries, *no* *πήρα* and *no* staff are allowed. Thus even at the level of visible outward appearance to others, the Q missionaries must have looked rather *un-like* Cynic preachers. Further, the fact that the Cynic *πήρα* was

(55) The fact that Q does not reflect a situation of total poverty is also pointed out by D. ZELLER, "Redaktionsprozesse und wechselnder 'Sitz im Leben' beim Q-Material", *LOGIA* (n. 50 above) 407f., referring to texts like Q 16,13. Vaage's parallel of Diogenes' remarks in Diogenes Laertius VI. 62 (Q 417; cf. also DOWNING, *Christ and the Cynics*, 26) seems rather inapt. Diogenes is there telling others who have lent to him not to ask for their property back. The Q exhortation is directed to Christians, not to outsiders, to lend.

(56) See J. PIPER, *Love Your Enemies* (SNTSMS 38; Cambridge 1979) 21-26. VAAGE, *Q*, 420f., objects to Piper's interpretation not because Piper is necessarily wrong about Epictetus and others, but because Piper is trying to press the Christian texts into a theologically acceptable mould. The possible difference in underlying ethos would not of course affect Downing's main thesis which is that the Christian exhortations would have sounded very similar to that of others, without necessarily meaning the same.

(57) Cf. Ps. Diogenes 30; Ps. Crates 23; Diogenes Laertius VI. 13, 23 and many others. Cf. too Dio 34.2: "It is customary for most people to give the name of Cynic to those who dress as I do". Thus in terms of "audience reaction" (cf. n. 9 above) appearance was of considerable importance.

in fact a begging "bowl" would mean that the Q missionaries, with no *πήρα*, would be very visibly different from Cynic preachers in their behaviour as it impinged on others, as well as in their dress: they were *not* to be beggars from the general public. Thus H. C. Kee comments:

The fact that the restrictions on the Christian itinerants were more severe than those placed on the Cynic preachers ... suggests that *there was a conscious differentiation* between the Christian charismatics and the Cynics, even though the basic methods of itinerancy and public preaching were so similar⁽⁵⁸⁾.

Theissen too makes a similar point:

Das Verbot von Tasche und Stab zielt wahrscheinlich darauf hin, auch den geringsten Anschein zu vermeiden, die christlichen Missionare seien solche oder ähnliche Bettler (d.h. Cynic preachers)⁽⁵⁹⁾.

Several of the remaining possible parallels between Q and Cynic traditions turn out to be extremely general when examined closely. One example of this is Downing's claim that in Q "John expects an acceptance of a humiliating public start to discipleship, as does Diogenes in a number of stories"⁽⁶⁰⁾, and elsewhere Downing refers to the fact that Cynics performed visual acts just as John baptised people⁽⁶¹⁾. However, the Cynic stories adduced as parallels here, of Diogenes offering his head to be struck (Diogenes Laertius VI. 21), or giving a would-be follower a tunny to carry (Diogenes Laertius VI. 36), bear only the most superficial of resemblances to John's baptism. It is not apparent why John's baptism should be regarded as a "humiliating" public start. Further, Cynics did not have a

⁽⁵⁸⁾ H. C. KEE, *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective* (London 1980) 58. (My italics)

⁽⁵⁹⁾ "Wanderradikalismus", 259 = *Studien*, 93. VAAGE, *Q*, 319-321, argues that the *πήρα* was not essential for the Cynic and that a refusal to carry a *πήρα* was simply a logical extension of Cynic principles. However, there is still little precedent for such an extension amongst Cynics themselves. Vaage can only appeal to Teles 44H (though there the *πήρα* [which is disapproved of] is the wallet in which the rich man accumulates wealth: it is not the Cynic's begging pack) and to Diogenes Laertius VI. 37, though this only says that Diogenes got rid of his cup from his *πήρα* (though *not* the *πήρα* itself) when he saw a child living apparently even more frugally than himself by drinking water without a cup.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ "Quite like Q", 205.

⁽⁶¹⁾ "Cynics", 586.

common "visual act" which symbolises the start of the life of any Cynic (unless it be taking the cloak, staff and wallet, but in that case the parallel in Q is *not* John's baptism). Diogenes' acts are simply one-off incidents.

One must also remember that Cynics were not the only people who used "visual acts" to get their message across. Such a way of acting is deeply embedded in the Jewish prophetic tradition and, as we shall see, there seem to be far stronger links in Q with this tradition than with anything to do with Cynicism. (The Jewish tradition also provides a far richer background for the use of a *washing* rite with cleansing imagery than anything to be found in Cynic texts)⁽⁶²⁾. Thus the tradition of John the Baptist baptising people can only be compared with the stories about Diogenes at a very high level of abstraction.

The claim that Cynic traditions and Q are similar in that both contain violent denunciation of opponents, and both use animal imagery⁽⁶³⁾, is scarcely more compelling. In the broadest possible terms, this is true, but once again, as soon as one becomes more specific, the parallels are less convincing. If the denunciations of John or Jesus in Q (cf. Q 3,7-9; 10,12-15) are to be seen as parallel to Cynic denunciations of society (or indeed if one is postulating that people at the time would have regarded them as similar), then the *content* of the denunciations is far more important. At this level, the differences between Q and the Cynic texts are far more striking than any general similarities. For what characterizes the denunciations in Q is the threat of an imminent, eschatological catastrophe. Downing admits that the eschatological element in Q is one of the features which is harder to parallel in Cynic traditions though he does attempt to provide a number of parallels⁽⁶⁴⁾. However, almost all the Cynic texts adduced simply discuss future, post-mortem existence or else refer to some kind of judgement in an indeterminate future; there is nothing about an imminent eschatological catastrophe. Further, the theme of eschatology pervades almost all of Q. Not only passages like Q 3,17; 6,20-23; 10,12-15; 17,22-37 are concerned with eschatology, but also passages like Q 6,36; 6,46;

⁽⁶²⁾ Cf. J. D. G. DUNN, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London 1970) ch. 2.

⁽⁶³⁾ DOWNING, "Quite like Q", 205.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ "Quite like Q", 205 and n. 28. Cf. too *Christ and the Cynics*, 9.

6,47-49; 10,2-16⁽⁶⁵⁾; 11,2-13⁽⁶⁶⁾; 11,14-23; 11,31f.; 11,49-51; 12,8f.; 12,31; 13,34f. are all dominated by the eschatological dimension. The denunciations in Q are thus quite different from those in Cynic texts and it is very doubtful whether anyone hearing such denunciations would ever have thought of any similarity with Cynics. In fact, once again the parallels between Q and the prophetic tradition, both in form and content, are far closer⁽⁶⁷⁾.

The common use of animal imagery also fails to convince. Many Cynic texts use animal imagery to portray other people as stupid (cf. "apes" in Ps. Diogenes 28.1, or "sheep" in Diogenes Laertius VI. 47), or else they play on the word κῶν to refer to Cynics themselves (cf. Diogenes Laertius VI. 55, 61). By contrast the "viper" imagery of Q 3,7, which has *Jewish* parallels, seems aimed at characterizing the audience as poisonous and dangerous⁽⁶⁸⁾. The language in Q is thus far stronger and more vituperative. Similarly, the lambs-wolves metaphor in Q 10, 3 is far better explained on the basis of the Jewish background: the saying seems to take up the imagery used of Israel in relation to Gentile oppressors and inverts it so that Israel herself is equated with the "wolves"⁽⁶⁹⁾. Once again

⁽⁶⁵⁾ For the eschatological aspect here, see A. D. JACOBSON, "The Literary Unity of Q. Lc 10,2-16 and Parallels as a Test Case", *LOGIA* (n. 50 above) 419-423.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ For the importance of eschatology in this section, see my "Q, Prayer and the Kindgom", *JTS* 40 (1989) forthcoming.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ Cf. M. SATO, *Q und Prophetie* (WUNT 2. Reihe 29; Tübingen 1988) 198ff. (the "Weheruf", cf. 10,12-15), 209f. (the "Mahnwort", cf. 3,7-9).

⁽⁶⁸⁾ Cf. W. FOERSTER, *TWNT* II, 815; SCHULZ, *Q*, 372, referring to 1 QH 5.27f. See too STRACK-BILLERBECK I, 114f.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ See HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 294, though Hoffmann also points out that the imagery is very old: cf. Homer, *Il.* 22,263 and many other examples in G. BORNKAMM, *TWNT* IV, 310. For Jewish evidence, cf. too Jer 5,6; Ezek 22,27; Zeph 3,3; Sir 13,17; 1 En 89,13f. VAAGE, *Q*, 306-313, sees here only a reference to a life of itinerancy, not necessarily of physical danger, stressing the need for ethical integrity. Vaage may well be right to question how much physical danger, or "persecution", was being faced by Q Christians. But even he concedes that the "wolves" provide danger for the "sheep". He is however unwilling to accept the polemical nature of the imagery, at one point (p. 101f.) dismissing such an interpretation on the grounds that the evidence is only one (late) reference in Strack-Billerbeck. However, texts like 1 En 89 may be relevant, and in any case, the imagery does not have to be interpreted with exactly the same application as in background texts (as Vaage sometimes assumes) to make its point. The language of the saying

it is the Jewish background which gives greatest force to the language used, and the parallel with Cynic texts can only be made at a very high level of abstraction.

The claim that both Cynics and Q Christians attract opposition⁽⁷⁰⁾ is also very general. Downing refers here to many Cynic appeals to the example of Socrates, and to Heracles' sufferings as a model for their own. However, such appeals to Socrates or Heracles are not peculiar to Cynics⁽⁷¹⁾. Perhaps more significant is the fact that Q makes no such appeal to Socrates or Heracles. Rather, the spiritual "ancestors" of the Q Christians in their experience of suffering and hostility are the Jewish prophets (cf. Q 6,22f.; 11,49-51; 13,34f.). The adoption by Q of the theme of the violent fate suffered by the prophets to explain the contemporary suffering of Christians is well known⁽⁷²⁾. So too the links with Wisdom traditions, whereby Wisdom becomes the agent who sends out the prophets (cf. Q 11,49) is very characteristic of Q⁽⁷³⁾. But of this there is nothing in the Cynic texts. It would appear once again that there are far deeper links between Q and Jewish prophetic traditions than with anything in Cynicism.

The same applies to the possible parallel between Q 7,25-27 and Cynic texts, where Downing adduces examples of encounters or comparisons between Cynic preachers and royal figures to illuminate Jesus' comparison of John the Baptist with "those who live in kings' houses"⁽⁷⁴⁾. However, the parallel is again only a very general one. Several of the Cynic texts cited concern an *encounter* between a Cynic and a royal figure (often Diogenes and Alexander as in e.g. Diogenes Laertius VI. 60, but cf. too Demonax and other officials in *Demonax* 38, 41). Moreover, the point of these stories is often to

may be to assure the Christians of their status and to claim that Jewish opponents of the Christian movement have forfeited their right to be regarded as the "true Israel".

⁽⁷⁰⁾ DOWNING, "Quite like Q", 207.

⁽⁷¹⁾ Cf. DUDLEY, *History*, 4; also some of the texts referred to by Downing are not clearly Cynic: cf. Epictetus II. xix. 24; III. xxiv. 113; IV. i. 163f.; Seneca *ep. mor.* 71.7.

⁽⁷²⁾ See O. H. STECK, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen 1967) and many others.

⁽⁷³⁾ See my *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis* (SNTSMS 44; Cambridge 1983) 164 with further references.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ DOWNING, "Quite like Q", 210; *Christ and the Cynics*, 37f.

show the Cynic's brilliance at verbal repartee, rather than highlighting any contrast between their life-styles, though some of the Cynic texts do refer to the poverty of the Cynic in contrast to the richness of others (e.g. Ps. Crates 13.1). Vaage sees a parallel between Jesus' reference to those in "soft clothing" and Cynic polemic against softness generally: Jesus is thus setting up a patently false picture of John since John was (probably historically) an opponent of such "softness" in being akin to a Cynic preacher⁽⁷⁵⁾. Vaage is surely right to see the suggestion that John wore such clothing as false; but it seems unnecessary to bring in the specifically Cynic background to make the point. In any case it is clear that the emphasis of the Q pericope lies elsewhere. The Q pericope is concerned not to highlight John's asceticism in contrast to others' riches (and certainly not to refer to John's brilliant verbal dexterity); rather it is clearly stated that John's status is to be seen not as an ideal Cynic wandering preacher but as a *prophet* — and indeed as more than a prophet (7,26). It is thus the prophetic category which is far more important for Q than any comparison with Cynicism.

The Jewish background is again far more significant than possible Cynic parallels to John's attack on any reliance on national heritage in Q 3,8⁽⁷⁶⁾. Most of the Cynic references given refer to good birth generally (e.g. Diogenes Laertius II. 31: "wealth and good birth bring no dignity"). They do not concern any specifically Jewish appeals to Israel's self-understanding as God's chosen nation. Once again it is the Jewish background which is essential to the point being made, and such a background does not surface in the Cynic traditions.

At other points, some of the parallels claimed involve agreement in vocabulary or imagery, but the use made of the same words differs considerably. This may be so in the case of Cynic parallels adduced to the beatitudes⁽⁷⁷⁾. It is true that Cynics do talk about true "happiness"⁽⁷⁸⁾, and also correlate this with poverty and simplicity. But a closer analysis reveals far more fundamental differences than similarities in underlying meaning. Most of the Cynic

⁽⁷⁵⁾ VAAGE, *Q*, 552-566.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ DOWNING, "Quite like Q", 205.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ "Quite like Q", 207.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ But then so do very many philosophers of the time: cf. MEEKS, *Moral World*, 46.

texts regard poverty as itself true happiness. Giving up one's possessions and being poor constitute true freedom (cf. Diogenes Laertius VI. 22f., 71; *Demonax* 71; Ps. Diogenes 31.4). This is quite different from the Q beatitudes which do not extol a life of poverty and hunger as such, but rather promise that, in an eschatological future, the present needs of the poor and hungry will be more than fully met⁽⁷⁹⁾. The eschatology of the beatitudes effectively removes Q a very great distance from any Cynic discussions of true happiness. (In any case one need look no further than the Jewish background to explain the existence of the beatitudes in Q)⁽⁸⁰⁾.

The same probably applies in the case of the Cares tradition in Q (12,22-31). Downing regards the Cynic texts as providing "some of the closest parallels" to Q here⁽⁸¹⁾, and the statement of Dio (10.16) has often been noted as a relevant parallel:

Consider the beasts yonder and the birds, how much freer from trouble they live than men and how much more happily also ... They have one very great blessing — they own no property.

The underlying ethos is however very different. With Cynics, the ethos is to give up possessions and live a life of austerity and physical deprivation in the belief that that life as such will provide true and lasting happiness. Q calls on Christians to give up their *security*, to rely on the the support of others (which they will receive cf. Q 12,31b) since God knows their needs before they ask and will

⁽⁷⁹⁾ Cf. KLOPPENBORG, *Formation*, 189. I remain unconvinced by Vaage's non-eschatological interpretation of the first beatitude (which then leads on to a similarly non-eschatological interpretation of the theme of the Kingdom in Q, interpreting the statements about the possession of the Kingdom as descriptions of the present reality of the poor living in accordance with nature: see his Q, 431-492). Along with most commentators, I would regard this beatitude as essentially future-oriented, in line with the future tenses in the other beatitudes, promising a change in the present circumstances of the poor. Vaage's interpretation of the Kingdom in Q would seem to founder on the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven. *Pace* Vaage, the comparisons here are *not* with "normal" events and what is described is *not* "an observation of natural life" (so VAAGE, Q, 445): mustard seeds do not produce trees! Cf. my *Reading the New Testament* (London 1987) 108f.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ Cf. W. D. DAVIES – D. C. ALLISON, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (Edinburgh 1988) 431-434.

⁽⁸¹⁾ "Quite like Q", 215, though some of the texts cited are not clearly Cynic: Philo, *de virtute* 6; Musonius 15; Epictetus I. ix. 9; xv. 3, 9.

supply them (cf. 12,30 and Matt 6,8). Asceticism as such is not the aim, nor perhaps even the result, of their chosen life-style. The Q missionaries give up all their security in order to proclaim their urgent message of the Kingdom of God. It is this theme of eschatology which dominates all forms of asceticism in Q and which alone provides the purpose of the (possibly) ascetic injunctions⁽⁸²⁾. Thus once again the theme of eschatology in Q serves to distinguish Q's ethos very sharply from Cynic texts. Further, the practical consequences of the Q ethos may be very different from that of the Cynics: the Q missionaries are not beggars; they may not even be (or appear) destitute since their needs will be met by God (perhaps through other Christians).

Similar considerations apply in the case of possible parallels between the calls to discipleship in Q and those in Cynic traditions. It is true that much is made in some Cynic texts of the difficulty of following the Cynic way of life (cf. Epictetus III. xxii. 9-11)⁽⁸³⁾ and the sayings in Q 9,57-60 invite comparison. However, in Q it is a question of following Jesus, not just of following an austere way of life which is itself the means and the end of the whole exercise. Further, it is much more likely that the Q sayings in 9,57-60 reflect a situation of rejection and hostility: the Q Christian is called to share in a common life of being rejected by his/her contemporaries with Jesus *qua* Son of Man, and it is this which results in deprivation and homelessness. The austerity is not a positive end in itself. Thus Hengel comments:

Here we certainly have the nearest philosophical analogy to the sayings about following in Q ... Jesus too demands complete freedom from the person who follows him; *though of course on the basis of an entirely different kind of reasoning and of a different objective*⁽⁸⁴⁾. (My italics)

It is perhaps worth noting here too that possible Cynic parallels to the Q saying "Let the dead bury their dead" (9,58) are also not very compelling. The Cynic texts (cf. Diogenes Laertius VI. 52, 79; *Demonax* 35; Ps. Diogenes 25.1; Teles 30H, 31H) all speak of the Cynic teacher being happily unconcerned about who will bury him

⁽⁸²⁾ See my "Q, Prayer and the Kingdom" (n. 66 above).

⁽⁸³⁾ DOWNING, "Quite like Q", 211f., 215.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ *Leader*, 30.

after he himself has died. This is very different from the gospel saying which has Jesus telling a man to forget about his filial duties in dealing with the burial of his father's body.

One set of alleged parallels between Q and Cynic texts should probably be rejected completely. Downing admits that the references in Q to Jesus' healing others (cf. Q 7,1-10; 11,14-16) are not easy to parallel in Cynic traditions, but he claims that there is still in Cynicism an important strand stressing health and physical wholeness⁽⁸⁵⁾. Such a Cynic emphasis is however far removed from Q's Jesus healing others miraculously. The Cynic traditions all concern the physical benefits which accrue to oneself from a life of hardship and training. Such an emphasis (not totally dissimilar to modern encouragement to take up jogging) has really nothing in common with Jesus as a miracle-worker, giving health miraculously to someone else and doing so by his powerful, authoritative word. Cynic views on health and Jesus' miracles in Q cannot really be correlated in this way.

* * *

Limitations of space have prevented a detailed discussion of every alleged parallel between Q and Cynic texts. However, enough has hopefully been said to show that the parallels are scarcely compelling. There is doubt about whether some of the "Cynic" texts cited should be regarded as Cynic. The eschatology which underlies so much of Q is absent from the Cynic tradition and hence many of the parallels turn out to be at best superficial. Other alleged similarities exist only at the level of very abstract generality, or common vocabulary; but the common vocabulary is set within such different

⁽⁸⁵⁾ DOWNING, "Quite like Q", 210. On the other hand, Vaage's attempt (Q, 334-341) to interpret the injunction to "heal the sick" in the mission charge in metaphorical terms (the "sick" are those who recognize the virtue of the Cynic way of life, and that way of life itself constitutes a therapy) seems very forced. In any case, such an outlook does not really fit the healing stories which actually occur in Q: there is little evidence that those who are healed from (physical) illnesses in Q are really ciphers for any who have not yet adopted a Cynic way of life. However, Vaage does point out that there is some evidence of Cynics being accredited with (physical) healing miracles (p. 459f.).

contexts (linguistically, socially, religiously) that it is hard to see how any possible similarities would have been noted, let alone taken seriously by anyone at the time. The garb of the Q missionaries seems designed deliberately to avoid any possible confusion between the Q Christians and Cynic preachers; and the ethos underlying their (in part) common appearance of itinerancy is widely different from the Cynic ethos. The stress in Q on miracles bears no relation at all to Cynic views on health. Finally, no appeal is ever made in Q to Cynic traditions as providing precedents for the activity or experience of the Christians. By contrast, Q does appeal frequently to the Jewish prophetic tradition as providing such precedents. In his recent book, M. Sato has impressively portrayed the strength of the parallels between Q and Jewish prophetic traditions. "Q und Prophetie" seems perhaps a more promising avenue of approach for the analysis of Q than an allegedly Cynic Q.

Faculty of Theology
University of Manchester
Manchester M13 9PL
Great Britain

C. M. TUCKETT

SOMMAIRE

Cet article examine la thèse qui veut que la source Q des *logia* synoptiques ait été formulée en pensant aux traditions des prédicateurs cyniques. Considérant les problèmes que pose la définition du terme «cynique», on y soutient qu'il faut être bien prudent avant d'identifier avec assurance telle ou telle «idée» comme particulière des Cyniques. L'article examine aussi le genre et le contenu de Q; il propose que les parallèles entre Q et les traditions cyniques sont plutôt ténus et qu'on en trouve effectivement de bien plus solides dans la tradition prophétique juive.

ANIMADVERSIONES

A Problem of Textual Circularity: The Alands on the Classification of New Testament Manuscripts

A milestone of NT textual research was reached in 1982 when Barbara and Kurt Aland published a textbook designed, for the most part, to serve as an introduction to textual criticism. *Der Text des Neuen Testaments* represents some of the fruit of the ongoing labor at the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung at Münster. It is an impressive book in scope and detail, one that will serve the interests of beginning and advanced scholar alike. The purpose of this short article is not to review the work *per se*⁽¹⁾. It is instead to take the opportunity afforded by the recent publication of its English translation⁽²⁾ to consider one of the critical issues it raises: the methodology used to classify NT MSS in terms of their textual affinities.

This is an issue raised not so much *in* the Alands' work as *by* it. Although they engage in none of the current debates about method, they devote a substantial portion of their book exclusively to providing concise descriptions and textual classifications of NT MSS. Indeed, the Alands describe and categorize *all* the known NT papyri (88 total)⁽³⁾, *all* the known NT uncials (257 total)⁽⁴⁾, and over 150 of the NT minuscule MSS determined to be of particular importance by the researchers at the Institute for NT Textual Research⁽⁵⁾. For such a thorough and detailed collection of important data, all students of the Greek NT must be exceedingly grateful. At the same time, since this work is certain to become a standard reference tool for scholars who wish to learn the textual character of one or another MS, it is extremely important to consider both how the Alands have proceeded in their analysis and what their system of classification entails.

At the outset it may be helpful to provide some context for these remarks by sketching the two methods of MS analysis and classification normally employed by scholars *not* associated with the Institute at Münster.

(1) The following reviews of the first German edition can be noted: C. AMPHOUX, *ETR* 58 (1983) 405-406; J. K. ELLIOTT, *TZ* 39 (1983) 247-249; J. KARAVIDOPOULOS, *BT* 34 (1983) 344-345; G. D. KILPATRICK, *NT* 25 (1983) 89-90; F. NEIRYNCK, *ETL* 58 (1982) 388-391; S. PISANO, *Bib* 66 (1985) 265-266.

(2) By Erroll Rhodes of the American Bible Society. *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids-Leiden 1987).

(3) *Ibid.*, 83-102.

(4) *Ibid.*, 102-125.

(5) *Ibid.*, 125-155.

Since a detailed history of these methods is available elsewhere⁽⁶⁾, this sketch can be kept very brief.

The Quantitative Method of Textual Analysis and Classification

About the middle of this century scholars became disenchanted with the age-old method of classifying NT MSS by counting the number of times they agree in their variations from the Textus Receptus. This method had made sense in the early eighteenth century, when most scholars considered the TR to represent the original text of the NT fairly reliably, so that (1) departures from it represented corruptions and (2) similarly corrupted texts could be grouped together by tabulating their agreements in such departures⁽⁷⁾. And the method continued to make sense even into the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when the TR itself was understood to represent a corrupted, later form of NT text. For then departures from TR were seen to represent vestiges of earlier textual forms, so that MSS with widespread agreements in variations from the TR could be grouped together and taken to embody non-Byzantine text types⁽⁸⁾. But it came to be realized that this approach to MS classification was inherently flawed, for it grouped MSS only on the basis of some of the evidence, overlooking instances in which MSS agree with one another in places where they do *not* diverge from the TR⁽⁹⁾.

After several abortive attempts at developing a more adequate approach to classification, a decisive breakthrough came when Ernest C. Colwell, then professor of NT at the University of Chicago, devised the so-called "Quantitative Method" of textual analysis⁽¹⁰⁾. *In nuce*, the quantitative method entails collating a number of MSS and establishing their proportional relationships to one another (expressed as a percentage) in all units of variation in which at least two of the MSS agree against all the others. The method works best when several of the leading representatives of previously known

⁽⁶⁾ See B. D. EHRMAN, "Methodological Developments in the Analysis and Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence", *NT* 29 (1987) 22-45.

⁽⁷⁾ *Ibid.*, 23-26.

⁽⁸⁾ *Ibid.*, 32-34.

⁽⁹⁾ This was first pointed out in 1945 in B. M. METZGER'S survey of research on the Caesarean text, "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels", reprinted in *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden 1963) 42-72. See EHRMAN, "Methodological Developments", 34-36.

⁽¹⁰⁾ See his revised and updated essays, found in *Studies in Methodology in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden 1969), esp. "Method in Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript", 26-44; and "Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationships Between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts", (with Ernest W. Tune) 56-62. The method was subsequently refined somewhat by other critics, notably G. D. FEE, "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John", *NTS* 15 (1968-69) 23-44; and "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Method in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations", *Bib* 52 (1971) 357-394; and L. HURTADO, *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text* (Grand Rapids 1981) 5-13. See EHRMAN, "Methodological Developments", 34-40.

textual groups (e.g. Early Alexandrian, Late Alexandrian, Western, the various Byzantine subgroups) are included in the collations, and when the complete text of a NT book is analyzed rather than test passages⁽¹¹⁾. Textual groups, then, are established on the grounds of textual consanguinity by ascertaining which witnesses have a high proportion of their texts in common, irrespective of their distance from or proximity to an external norm (e.g. the TR). After such groupings are determined the textual critic can then proceed to evaluate the significance of the groups for understanding how the NT text was transmitted over the centuries, and for reconstructing the original text of the NT — that elusive goal of the entire discipline⁽¹²⁾. And in fact the method has been used with remarkable success in both these areas⁽¹³⁾.

It is somewhat surprising that despite the advances made by the use of this method, and indeed without even acknowledging them, the Alands go their own way in classifying NT MSS. But before detailing their approach, it would be well to mention the other method commonly employed by textual critics today, a method also bypassed by the Alands in their work.

The Claremont Profile Method

The Claremont Profile Method was devised by Frederick Wisse and Paul McReynolds for the evaluation of the Greek MSS of the Gospel of Luke for the International Greek New Testament Project⁽¹⁴⁾. The committee working

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf., e.g., Larry RICHARDS' analysis of the entire text of the Johannine epistles: *The Classification of the MSS of the Johannine Epistles* (SBLDS 35; Missoula 1975). See EHRMAN, "Methodological Developments", 39.

⁽¹²⁾ On the use of textual groupings for making textual decisions, see further pp. 384-385 below.

⁽¹³⁾ It has been used, e.g., to establish a complete taxonomy of the MSS of the Johannine epistles (RICHARDS, *Classification*), to show the fallacy of the notions of a pre-Caesarean text (HURTADO, *Text-Critical Methodology*), to ascertain the true relationship of the Early and Late Alexandrian texts of the Gospels (B. D. EHRMAN, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels* [The New Testament in the Greek Fathers, 1; Atlanta 1986]), and to demonstrate once and for all the textual character of a host of significant textual witnesses: in addition to the works cited here and in note 10, see G. D. FEE, "Origen's New Testament and the Text of Egypt", *NTS* 28 (1982) 348-364; id., "P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen: The Myth of Textual Recension in Alexandria", *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (ed. R. N. LONGENECKER - M. C. TENNEY) (Grand Rapids 1974) 19-45; id., *Papyrus Bodmer II (P⁶⁶): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics* (SD 34; Salt Lake City 1968); id., "The Text of John and Mark in the Writings of Chrysostom", *NTS* 26 (1979-80) 525-547; and C. D. OSBURN, "The Text of the Pauline Epistles in Hippolytus of Rome", *Second Century* 2 (1982) 97-124.

⁽¹⁴⁾ A full statement concerning the origin and logic of the Claremont Profile Method is provided by Frederick WISSE in an updated and revised version of his dissertation, *The Profile Method for the Classification and Evaluation of Manuscript Evidence* (SD 44; Grand Rapids 1982). For an assessment of the method, with particular attention to its shortcomings for making a thorough analysis of textual affinities, see B. D. EHRMAN, "The Use of Group Profiles for the Analysis and Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence", *JBL* 106 (1987) 465-486. A briefer treatment can be found in EHRMAN, "Methodological Developments", 40-44.

on this project envisaged an apparatus that would cite representative MSS of every known group and subgroup, including all of the numerous Byzantine subgroups. But there was considerable question concerning the integrity of many of the previously established groupings, particularly within the Byzantine tradition. Many of them had been established at the beginning of the century by Hermann von Soden, in his magisterial but error-ridden edition of the Greek NT⁽¹⁵⁾. And a large number of MSS had never been fully classified at all. This left Wisse and McReynolds with the monstrous task of collating and classifying some 1385 MSS of the Gospel of Luke.

In the beginning stages of their work they realized that a thoroughgoing quantitative method was absolutely impracticable for a task of this magnitude, since it requires such time-consuming and detailed collations and statistical computations. It was their great fortune, then, that a faster and essentially reliable method⁽¹⁶⁾ of determining a MS's basic consanguinity emerged in the course of their work. Wisse and McReynolds came to see that MSS of the same groups and subgroups share entire sets or patterns of readings in common. Once a hundred or so MSS of a NT book have been collated in full, these patterns are fairly distinctive, so that other MSS need be collated only for the verses that contain variant readings characteristic of one or another pattern. Rather than engaging, therefore, in a statistical analysis of all the MSS in their total variation, McReynolds and Wisse proceeded to ascertain the "profiles" (i.e. the patterns of variation) of the various textual groups, and to collate other MSS so as to situate them in this or that profile.

In some respects the Claremont Profile Method has proved remarkably successful. Certainly it proved an immense aid to the International Greek New Testament Project, a project notoriously (if understandably) slow in publishing its apparatus: Wisse now claims to be able to ascertain the essential consanguinity of an unknown MS of Luke in no more than thirty minutes. And like the Quantitative Method — which is obviously a more sure-fire way of determining consanguinity when one is not confronted with the overwhelming task of assigning over a thousand MSS to textual groups — it has been used successfully in subsequent studies⁽¹⁷⁾.

⁽¹⁵⁾ *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 4 vols. (Berlin 1902-11). For early assessments of the accuracy of von Soden's work, see H. C. HOSKIER, "Von Soden's Text of the New Testament", *JTS* 15 (1914) 307-326; and A. SOUTER, "Von Soden's Text of the Greek New Testament Examined in Selected Passages", *The Expositor*, 8th Series, 10 (1915) 429-444. More recently see WISSE, *Profile Method*, 11-12.

⁽¹⁶⁾ With emphasis on the word "essentially". See the criticisms of the method in EHRMAN, "Group Profiles", 468-471.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Apart from the International Greek New Testament Project, for example, WISSE, *Profile Method*, has published the results of his labors on the MS tradition of Luke, not only confirming in some instances the widespread assumption of the inaccuracy of von Soden's classifications, but also presenting a viable taxonomy of the Lucan MSS. Other noteworthy analyses using the method include: J. M. ALEXANIAN, "The Claremont Profile Method and the Armenian Version", unpublished paper read at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, New Testament Textual Criticism Section, November 1985; P. McREYNOLDS, "The Claremont Profile Method and the Armenian Version", unpublished paper read at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, New Testament Textual Criticism Section, November 1985.

But also like the Quantitative Method, the Claremont Profile Method receives no discernible attention in the Alands' book nor, apparently, in their work at the Institute. What method then *do* the Alands use to classify NT MSS?

The Alands' System of MS Classification

Unlike scholars who use the Quantitative Method and the Claremont Profile Method, the Alands are not primarily concerned to locate MSS in the traditional textual groupings (e.g. Neutral/Alexandrian, Caesarean, Western) on the basis of their textual consanguinity. In part this is due to the Alands' misgivings concerning the labels given these groups: they rightly find, for example, the terms "Neutral" and "Western" to be inappropriate⁽¹⁸⁾. And in part it derives from their own conception of the development of the NT MS tradition, in which they find no evidence of self-contained "Western" or "Caesarean" groups, and indeed no evidence of any clearly defined textual groups at all prior to the fourth century⁽¹⁹⁾. But for the most part the Alands do not classify MSS according to textual group and subgroup because their ultimate concern — ironically, as we shall see — is to determine which among the extant MSS are closest to the "original" text of the NT. In short, the Alands classify MSS according to their historical or textual proximity to the NT autographs, not strictly according to textual consanguinity.

The Alands' Five Categories

The Alands locate each NT papyrus and uncial MS, as well as some 150 minuscules, in five categories, differentiated from one another by their "usefulness" in determining the original text of the NT. Category I comprises MSS "of a very special quality which should always be considered in establishing the original text"⁽²⁰⁾. This category includes all MSS of the (Early) Alexandrian text-type and all papyri and uncials that antedate the third-

NOLDS "The Value and Limitations of the Claremont Profile Method", *SBL Proceedings* (ed. L. C. McGAUGHY) (n.p. 1972) 1-8 ; and RICHARDS, *Classification*.

⁽¹⁸⁾ *Text*, 50-71, esp. 67-71.

⁽¹⁹⁾ *Ibid.* The Alands, in fact, base a great deal of their textual theory on the claim that our familiar "text-types" did not start to develop until the fourth century, making it inappropriate to classify MSS from earlier periods according to text-type. Particularly it is of no use to speak of "mixed" texts prior to the development of the "pure" texts (p. 59). But the Alands' own proposed categories for the "Early" text (i.e. prior to third-fourth centuries) present unique problems of their own. There are forty-one papyri and four or five uncials of this early period, none of whose exemplars, of course, have survived. Yet the Alands classify these MSS according to how closely they resemble their exemplars! Thus these early MSS are labeled "free" (= loose transcription of the exemplar), "normal" (= relatively faithful transcription), and "strict" (= meticulous transcription). How can a MS be known to be a strict copy of an exemplar that no critic has ever laid eyes on?

⁽²⁰⁾ ALAND, *Text*, 105.

fourth centuries, irrespective of their textual affinities⁽²¹⁾. The Alands do not say whether Category I includes any *other* MSS — i.e. non-Alexandrian MSS produced after the fourth century.

Category II contains MSS “of a special quality, but distinguished from manuscripts of Category I by the presence of alien influences (particularly of the Byzantine text), and yet of importance for establishing the original text”⁽²²⁾. MSS of the Egyptian text (= Late Alexandrian, i.e. less pure representatives of the Alexandrian tradition) are found here. Other MSS are found here as well⁽²³⁾, but their textual affinities are never discussed. Of the five categories, these first two are obviously the most important. The Alands repeatedly urge beginning students to memorize their contents.

MSS located in Category III are said to have “a distinctive character with an independent text usually important for establishing the original text, but particularly important for the history of the text (e.g. f¹ f¹³)”⁽²⁴⁾. This is the most amorphous of the five categories, because the Alands do not disclose *how* these MSS are important for establishing the original text⁽²⁵⁾, nor *why* they are important for understanding the history of the text. Nor do they indicate what textual groupings are represented here, outside of f¹ and f¹³.

Category IV comprises MSS of the D text (i.e. those related to Codex Bezae). This is the only category established exclusively on the basis of textual affinities. Category V, however, is based largely on such considerations, containing MSS “with a purely or predominantly Byzantine text, or with a text too brief or colorless [?] to be of any real importance for establishing the original text”⁽²⁶⁾.

The Criteria for the Categories

Before evaluating the usefulness of this system of classifying MSS, in contrast, say, to the conventional system of establishing groups strictly on the basis of textual consanguinity, we would do well to consider the criteria the Alands have used to locate MSS in their appropriate categories. While the Alands do not provide all the details of this process — and indeed much of

⁽²¹⁾ In their view these MSS were produced before various localities began standardizing their texts, a standardization that led to the development of text-types. See *Text*, 55-71 and the comments in note 19 above. Inexplicably, P²¹ is not located in this category, even though it comes from the third century.

⁽²²⁾ *Ibid.*, 105-106.

⁽²³⁾ The Alands cite the Egyptian MSS as an *example* of what one can find in this category. But normally they do not state *why* a MS is located in Category II rather than Categories I or III. Thus, as just one of a number of peculiarities, Codex Koridethi (Θ) is found there, even though it is commonly cited as a leading representative of the “Caesarean” text, and in any case is certainly not “Egyptian” in its affinities.

⁽²⁴⁾ *Ibid.*, 106.

⁽²⁵⁾ They apparently are not *as* important as MSS of Categories I and II, but to what extent they are to be considered in making textual judgments is an issue that is never addressed. See further, p. 386 below.

⁽²⁶⁾ *Ibid.*, 106.

it is shrouded in mystery — they do indicate the general procedure employed at the Institute. Kurt Aland devised a list of “test passages” throughout the NT for which every MS was to be collated⁽²⁷⁾. Although the Alands have not indicated which passages are involved, nor published the results of these collations, they have provided a compact summary of the statistical data considered to be crucial for locating a MS. This summary reveals the textual alignments of each MS (with sufficient text) in terms of four distinct categories: “1: agreements with the Byzantine text; 1/2: agreements with the Byzantine text where it has the same reading as the original text; 2: agreements with the original text; S: independent or distinctive readings (i.e., special readings, ‘Sonderlesarten’)”⁽²⁸⁾.

What do these statistical categories actually mean? Presumably “independent or distinctive” readings are readings unique or virtually unique to the witness (including accidental error? nonsense?), while Byzantine readings are those shared by the majority of witnesses of the various subgroups of the Byzantine tradition. But what are readings of the “original” text? It is here that one of the peculiar difficulties of the Alands’ system of classification begins to emerge. By “original text” the Alands mean the “Standard” text — i.e. the text reconstructed by the five editors of the UBS Greek NT (of which Kurt Aland was one) and used by the Alands for the NA²⁶ edition. This at least seems to be the position assumed throughout their discussion⁽²⁹⁾. MSS with the highest incidence of readings of this “original text” are placed in Category I, as “most useful for determining the original text”, those with fewer such readings in Category II, etc.

The reader will now detect a curious bit of circularity in this proceeding. MSS are placed in Category I because they are most helpful for determining the “original text” of the NT. How do we know? Because these are the MSS that most frequently preserve the “original text” of the NT! If this reading of the Alands’ procedure is correct, then by equating the “original”

⁽²⁷⁾ *Text*, 106, 128. In an earlier publication (“The Significance of the Papyri for Progress in New Testament Research”, *The Bible in Modern Scholarship* [ed. J. P. HYATT] [Nashville 1965] 42-44) Aland refers to 1000 test passages drawn *only* from Mark, John chs. 1-10, Acts, Paul, and the Catholic epistles. Whether this is the actual number still being used at the Institute cannot be determined from the more recent publication. But since in the statistical summaries provided, several MSS are said to have from 900-950 readings (e.g., Codex κ with 940) that are either “original”, “Byzantine”, or “singular”, the number may be a close approximation, allowing for some readings that are not original or Byzantine but that are nonetheless shared with other MSS. If the statistical summaries provided here *are* drawn from this same set of test passages, it is surprising that the Alands can claim to classify MSS of the Gospels without considering *any* readings of Matthew, Luke, or the second half of John.

⁽²⁸⁾ *Text*, 106.

⁽²⁹⁾ Consider, e.g., the following statement: “The editors of the ‘Standard text’ certainly do not claim infallibility. They do, however, recognize that to the best of their knowledge and abilities, and with resources unmatched for any manual edition of the New Testament in modern times, they have edited a text which comes as close as possible to the original form of the New Testament writings... It is now for translators to transmit these results to those who are unable to read the original texts of the New Testament” (306-307).

text of the NT with the "Standard" text, and by using it as their basis of MS evaluation, they appear to have produced not so much a tool of MS classification as a tautology — at least for Categories I and II, which they intend to be of greatest service to their fellow-critics. These two categories will help to identify MSS that best attest the text of our two most popular editions of the Greek NT, but they will not assist us significantly in our quest to ascertain the textual nature of variant readings.

Here it should be noted that this trap of circularity is avoided by the traditional approach to classification, as devised but used imperfectly by the pioneers of the discipline such as Bentley, Bengel, and Griesbach, and developed on scientific principles by the Quantitative and Claremont Profile Methods discussed above. Even those critics who voice an absolute preference for one type of text or another (e.g. Early Alexandrian or Western) nonetheless *classify* MSS according to how extensively they relate to *one another*. Whatever their shortcomings, the traditional labels — e.g. Early Alexandrian, Late Alexandrian, Caesarean, Western, and Byzantine — imply neither value judgments nor proximity to the autographs⁽³⁰⁾. Within these categories, which could just as well be labeled A, B, C, and D, are located MSS with wide-ranging textual similarities. In other words, establishing the textual classification of a MS, in the traditional approach, does not amount to passing a value judgment on it. It is only *after* the MSS have been classified that the groupings are considered in terms of their usefulness for determining original versus corrupt readings.

The Usefulness of the Alands' Categories

This leads now to a consideration of the practical usefulness of the Alands' five categories for evaluating textual readings. To this end it may be helpful first to review how textual groups are normally employed by critics seeking to establish the original reading of a text in the face of textual variation.

Normally textual critics find MS classification to be useful in two ways. The first has to do with the relative quality of each of the "group texts". From the earliest days of the discipline it has been recognized that MSS can be grouped together only because they share a common ancestry. Although this notion of common ancestry has led some critics down blind alleys, it is nonetheless true that MSS normally share readings in common because they ultimately derive from a common source — either from the original text or from an archetype that introduced a corruption of it. Once MSS are grouped together on the basis of their textual affinities, the textual groups can then be evaluated with respect to the kinds of readings they have in common in places in which MSS of other groups attest variation. On the basis of these evaluations, one group may be seen to approximate more closely than the others to the original text. Thus, for example, if one group typically attests

⁽³⁰⁾ With this can be contrasted, of course, Westcott and Hort's designation of the "Neutral" text.

readings that are harmonized with other passages or that are conflated from readings of other parts of the textual tradition, this group would typically be less valuable for determining the original text of the NT at any particular point of variation. Conversely a group that normally does not attest secondary harmonizations or conflations is more likely to preserve the original text. Thus in the traditional approach of classification, once MS categories have been established on the basis of textual consanguinity, they can be evaluated *qua* groups, and so be used in making textual decisions, the superior group(s) being given greater weight than the inferior at any given point.

The second way critics use textual groupings is by considering groups not in terms of their individual superiority but in their patterns of combination with one another in support of a given reading. Without going into all the complexities of this procedure, it can be stated simply that certain combinations of group support, in the judgment of most critics, provide strong evidence for the genuineness of one variant reading over another. Thus, e.g., a reading found only in Early Alexandrian and Western texts is commonly judged original, given the early dates and apparent independence of these two textual groups. Similarly, but somewhat less expectedly, it has been impressively demonstrated by G. Zuntz (and to my knowledge his arguments have never been refuted) that Byzantine readings with Western support (understood here in a geographical sense) have a superior claim to being original⁽³¹⁾.

Now quite apart from the validity of this or that particular detail in these two common applications of manuscript groupings, one should ask whether the categories proposed by the Alands can be used similarly, and if not, how they *are* practicable. An interesting irony here, as the careful reader will have already surmised, is that of the Alands' five categories, only the final two — the ones devaluated by the Alands as of almost no use for establishing the original text of the NT — can actually be used by the critic in evaluating a reading with respect to group support. For only these two categories are based entirely on considerations of textual consanguinity⁽³²⁾. They can therefore be utilized in either of the ways just discussed: if, for instance, the D and Byzantine texts are understood normally to preserve inferior readings wherever variation is present, then a reading found exclusively among the MSS of Categories IV or V is automatically suspect. And if a reading is found in both of these Categories, it could, at least in theory, have a claim to authenticity⁽³³⁾.

⁽³¹⁾ *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition on the Corpus Paulinum* (London 1953) esp. 55-56; 213-215.

⁽³²⁾ Even in Category V, however, there is some room for doubt, since the Alands admit that not only Byzantine but also MSS with too brief or "colorless" (?) texts are included there.

⁽³³⁾ It must be pointed out, however, that since Zuntz really did mean Western in the geographical sense, not as a designation of the D text, he would not have argued for the authenticity of readings found jointly in Alands' Categories IV and V, but would have agreed with most critics who see such combinations as Western readings taken over by the Byzantine tradition.

What of the remaining three categories? Category III, at least as presented by the Alands here, is of little practical use to the textual critic. All we know of this group is that it includes the MSS of f^1 and f^{13} , along with a veritable host of others, and that these MSS, while somewhat useful for establishing the original text of the NT, are particularly important for reconstructing the history of the text. But we are not told how they can be used for either of these purposes, nor what the exact grounds were for placing MSS in this group — except, of course, that they do not attest the Byzantine, D, or “original” texts to as great an extent as MSS of the other categories. And since a MS is *not* placed here because it is textually similar to other MSS in the group, it could well share a higher number of readings with MSS of other categories than with those of Category III. Thus a list of MSS labeled Category III, when they are not further classified with respect to their individual textual affinities, is really of very limited practical use.

What now of the MSS in Categories I and II? Unfortunately, even though the Alands consider these categories to be most valuable for textual critics, their usefulness is seriously restricted by the way they have been established, i.e. apart from the strict consideration of textual consanguinity. As pointed out, MSS are located in these categories not because they necessarily bear a close relationship to one another, although in many instances this of course will be true as well, but because individually they stand in close (Category I) or relatively close (Category II) proximity to the “original” text. Thus the Alands tell us explicitly that Category I includes the oldest extant MSS, despite the fact that many of these are textually unrelated to the Alexandrian MSS that are also found here. And while one can know that the Alands consider the MSS of Category I to be superior to those of Category II — either because of their greater age or proximity to the Standard text — they do *not* reveal what is equally important to know: what scientific grounds have been used to distinguish between the MSS of the two categories. *How much* “foreign” influence requires a MS’s demotion to Category II? Apparently the “foreign influence” characteristic of these Category II MSS is not a *shared* influence — i.e. these MSS are not located in Category II because they have the same textual corruptions, but because they share a greater or lesser distance from that amorphous norm, the “original text”.

How then can these two categories be used? Not in either of the ways scholars have traditionally used MS groupings. One cannot consider the *kinds* of variation attested in Category I or II and thereby ascertain the kind of text represented there, so as to evaluate its quality. The Alands have already told us that the groups are not based exclusively on the grounds of textual consanguinity. Nor can the critic speak of a convincing combination of group support for a variant reading, for the same reason.

How then are the classifications to be used in evaluating the external evidence for a set of variant readings? Apparently the critic is supposed to ascertain which reading is supported most extensively by the MSS that the Alands have prejudged to be “most useful”. Not only does this amount to little more than counting MSS — although to be sure it is now counting MSS in their pre-weighted categories — but it also involves the critic once again in

a curious bit of circularity. For if the critic wants to determine which variant reading is original, and uses the Alands' categories to decide, then the reading already found in today's critical editions will in virtually every instance be given the palm. That is to say, by counting the support of Category I and II MSS for a reading — MSS that by definition stand closest to the "standard" text shared by the UBS³ and NA²⁶ editions — one will simply discover the reading of these editions.

Conclusions and Suggestions

The criticisms leveled at the Alands' approach to MS classification here are not meant to detract from the other merits of their book. *The Text of the New Testament* is an otherwise impressive introduction to text-critical theory and to the modern critical editions. And as previously indicated, all NT scholars — textual specialists and non-specialists alike — are deeply in the Alands' debt for such convenient summaries of such extensive and significant textual data. But the Alands' classification of Greek MSS according to their "usefulness" in establishing the original text of the NT is circular and impracticable. If textual witnesses are to be used to reconstruct the original wording of the NT, and not simply evaluated in terms of their proximity to a pre-determined "original", then a precise determination of their textual affinities to one another continues to be a *sine qua non*. How then are we to proceed?

The surest measure of a witness's textual consanguinity is its proportional relationship to other witnesses in total variation. Demonstrating such relationships is the sole aim of the "quantitative method" of analysis. As we have seen, this method operates totally without bias as to the superiority of one witness or group over another. And its sophisticated applications in recent years have repeatedly vindicated the method by providing clear and compelling results. Future work in MS classification will necessarily continue its systematic use.

At the same time, several recent studies have demonstrated a drawback to the use of the quantitative method when used in isolation⁽³⁴⁾. Because it considers the relationships of individual witnesses only to one another, there are occasionally instances of otherwise unrelated MSS sharing a higher than expected proportion of their readings due to "accidental agreements in error". While the phenomenon is not so widespread as to skew the results of a quantitative analysis altogether, it is common enough to require a supplementary method to provide nuance to its findings. Just such a method is at hand in the Claremont Profile Method and the other profile methods that have been devised more recently to match the level of sophistication achieved by the quantitative method⁽³⁵⁾. Rather than calculating the number of instances in which witnesses agree in total variation, these profile

⁽³⁴⁾ See esp. FEE "Text of John in Origen and Cyril"; RICHARDS, *Classification*; and EHRMAN, *Didymus the Blind*.

⁽³⁵⁾ See EHRMAN, "Group Profiles".

methods evaluate a witness's attestation of readings that are characteristic of known textual groups. In effect, the method minimizes the impact of "accidental agreements". The use of such profiles, then, serves to confirm and refine the results obtained by a quantitative analysis.

Consequently, the most accurate way to classify the witnesses of the NT text is to use the quantitative and profile methods in tandem⁽³⁶⁾. As we have noted, only when such classifications have been made can the textual groups be evaluated in terms of their relative merits, both individually and in combination. And only then can we forge ahead with confidence to reconstruct the original text of the NT and the history of its subsequent transmission.

University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
U.S.A.

Bart D. EHRMAN

⁽³⁶⁾ As is done, for example, in the works cited in note 34 above. On the problems of using the Claremont Profile Method in isolation, without a quantitative analysis, see EHRMAN, "Group Profiles", 468-471.

Sur un problème de temps chez Saint Paul (Col 3,1-4)

Traduire du grec en latin ou en français n'est pas un travail de tout repos parce que le grec possède un temps, un mode, une voix inconnus des deux langues. La nôtre se heurte souvent à des difficultés insurmontables lorsqu'elle cherche à rendre exactement certains temps du présent et le temps de l'aoriste; et cela est nécessaire en particulier dans les cas où une opposition leur donne du relief. Renoncer fait perdre au temps la finesse de sa nuance et sa force à la phrase. Le problème devient grave lorsqu'il s'agit de saisir d'abord, de traduire ensuite, le texte grec de la parole de Dieu.

En réponse à une question reçue on voudrait ici donner un exemple tiré des quatre premiers versets du chapitre 3 de l'Épître aux Colossiens. Ils forment un ensemble aux éléments inséparables et posent un problème de méthode.

1. Εἰ οὖν συνηγήεσθε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ καθημένος· 2. τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε, μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· 3. ἀπεθάνετε γάρ, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ· 4. Ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῇ, ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν(!), τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ φανερωθήσεσθε ἐν δόξῃ.

Vulgate: 1. Igitur, si consurrexistis cum Christo, quae sursum sunt quaerite, ubi Christus est in dextera Dei sedens; 2. quae sursum sunt sapite, non quae super terram; 3. mortui enim estis, et vita vestra est abscondita cum Christo in Deo. 4. Cum Christus apparuerit, vita vestra, tunc et vos apparebitis cum ipso in gloria.

On tentera de résoudre chaque problème, surtout de temps, selon l'ordre des versets.

Verset 1

Le verbe συνεγείρειν, du grec tardif, est trois fois dans la Septante (notamment Is 14,9). Si le verbe simple ἐγείρειν, «réveiller», «faire lever», est courant dans le Nouveau Testament, le composé avec le préverbe συν- («avec») n'est que chez Paul, Ep 2,6; Col 2,12 (sous la même forme qu'ici) et dans le présent verset. Il n'offre aucune difficulté de sens en soi, mais le français ne possède pas le verbe composé équivalent. Il est donc obligé de recourir à «faire lever avec», ou «réveiller en même temps».

(!) La leçon ἡμῶν, «notre», est moins bien attestée; elle est un des nombreux cas d'iotacisme; elle ne change rien à l'essentiel du sens.

Il importe cependant de rendre en συνηγόρητε aussi bien le temps de l'aoriste que la voix du passif. Le passif montre que les destinataires de l'épître ne ressusciteront pas tout seuls, pas plus que Paul, après sa vision de Damas, ne «s'est relevé», ἡγέρθη⁽²⁾ par ses propres moyens.

Quant à l'aoriste, sa présence dans une proposition conditionnelle à l'indicatif donne à la conjonction initiale εἰ le sens de «s'il est vrai que», et ne fait pas difficulté. Mais une traduction du type «si vous êtes ressuscités» donnerait à croire que le temps est un parfait, alors que le verbe grec ne désigne pas un *état*, mais un *moment*. L'aoriste exige une traduction du type «s'il est vrai que *vous avez été ressuscités* (ou "relevés") avec le Christ...», ou encore, pour mieux souligner, grâce à un passé simple, le moment à partir duquel fut transformée la condition des Colossiens à qui Paul s'adresse, «s'il est vrai que *vous fûtes ressuscités* avec le Christ...».

Le verbe suivant est un impératif, ζητεῖτε, «cherchez», un impératif *présent*; c'est-à-dire qu'il signifie la *durée*, la persévérance ou, ce qui revient à peu près au même, la répétition. «Cherchez les choses d'en haut» pourrait sans doute se traduire, du français au grec, par un impératif *aoriste*, mais le sens serait alors différent, «*mettez-vous* à chercher les choses d'en haut», parce que, à l'impératif, l'aoriste signifie le début de l'action ordonnée, ou le simple fait de l'action, sans notion de temps. Dans notre langue il est malaisé de rendre la différence entre les deux impératifs du grec⁽³⁾. Afin de la rendre ici sans enlever de sa force à l'ordre de Paul, on est contraint d'ajouter un adverbe, «toujours», ou «sans cesse», sinon, de recourir à l'addition d'un verbe, «continuez à chercher». L'adjonction n'a rien d'une trahison. Il est simplement impossible de lui échapper.

Les choses à chercher sans relâche sont «celles d'en haut», là où le Christ ἔστιν ... καθήμενος. On traduit quelquefois «là où *est* le Christ, assis à la droite de Dieu». C'est donner au verbe «être» une importance que, s'agissant de Jésus, il peut avoir; mais il ne l'a sans doute pas ici parce que nous avons affaire à un «parfait périphrastique», fréquent dans le Nouveau Testament. Ce parfait passif est scindé en deux parties, la première étant le verbe «être» ajouté, alors que le parfait ordinaire a la simple forme κάθεται, et la seconde le participe du verbe. Cet emploi peut quelquefois ne rien ajouter à la valeur du parfait, mais on croit ici qu'il est dû à une volonté d'insistance sur l'*état*, acquis pour toujours, car c'est la place éternelle de Jésus à la droite du Père. Par la séparation de ses deux éléments, la formule biblique reçoit son sens plein.

⁽²⁾ Voir Ac 9,8 (Belles Lettres, 1982) et la note; voir aussi *Évangile de Luc* (Belles Lettres, 1976) 9,7 et 11,31, avec les notes.

⁽³⁾ Cette différence apparaît clairement dans les deux versions du Pater. Là où Matthieu écrit δός (aoriste) ἡμῖν σήμερον, parce que l'on demande à Dieu de donner *aujourd'hui*, σήμερον, la pain, Luc écrit δίδου (présent) ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, parce que l'on demande à Dieu de donner le pain *tous les jours*, τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν. En français on emploie le même impératif pour traduire les deux du grec, «donne-nous».

Verset 2

On retrouve d'abord, dans une phrase juxtaposée⁽⁴⁾, «les choses d'en haut». Elles sont le complément, complément *direct* d'un second impératif *présent*, *φρονεῖτε*, dans l'emploi *transitif* d'un verbe, impliquant un travail de l'esprit, qui est d'ordinaire intransitif, «penser», «réfléchir».

Il semble important, dès lors, de conserver tout ce que le verbe a de transitif, c'est-à-dire de lui garder un complément direct, qui supprime tout intermédiaire entre le verbe et son objet sans lui enlever sa force de présent. Une inversion peut aider à mettre en valeur ce complément direct, «les choses d'en haut, tenez-les en l'esprit».

A ces choses d'en haut s'opposent celles d'en bas. L'opposition peut mieux apparaître si l'on évite de traduire la préposition *ἐπὶ* suivie du génitif par un simple «sur», qui ne laisse pas voir assez que ces choses d'en bas demeurent comme au contact de la terre, en étant *déposées* sur elle. A «sur» on préférera recourir à la préposition un peu vieillie sans doute en cet emploi, mais qui a ses titres de noblesse, «dessus».

Verset 3

Ce verset apporte l'explication, maintenant coordonnée, de la pensée précédente, par la conjonction *γάρ*, «car». Cette explication semble donnée tout de suite par le verbe *ἀπεθάνετε*, toujours traduit par «vous êtes morts», ainsi que par le verbe qui suit, le parfait *κρύπται*, «est caché», puisqu'il lui est coordonné par une autre conjonction, cette fois *καί*, «et». Mais une question se pose: les deux verbes *ainsi liés* l'un à l'autre se trouvent-ils sur le même plan, quand le premier est à l'aoriste et le second au parfait?

Avant d'aller plus loin il convient de donner sa traduction à l'aoriste du verbe «mourir», *ἀπεθάνετε*. La chose est difficile avec ce verbe plus qu'avec un autre parce que, si on le rend en français par «vous êtes morts», il est pris pour un parfait du grec, et signifie «vous êtes dans l'état de mort», alors en parallèle normal, lui étant lié par «et», avec le parfait du grec qui suit, «est caché».

Il est donc indispensable, plus que jamais, de montrer d'abord que nous sommes en face d'un aoriste, qui signifie en soi non pas l'état de la mort, mais l'instant, ou l'acte même, si l'on peut dire, de la mort⁽⁵⁾. Dans la phrase de Paul l'important est d'abord de comprendre que les Colossiens chrétiens auxquels il écrit ont trouvé, par le baptême, tout à la fois la mort au péché et la naissance à une vie nouvelle, puisqu'ils ont revêtu «l'homme

⁽⁴⁾ L'absence de coordination, exceptionnelle en grec, attire l'attention sur ce qui est juxtaposé.

⁽⁵⁾ Certaines phrases du français sont éclairantes: le «Je suis mort», dans la bouche d'Harpagon, est le parfait passif du verbe «mourir», puisqu'il est suivi d'un même parfait, «je suis assassiné». «Madame se meurt, Madame est morte»: après un présent, un parfait passif, et l'opposition des temps illustre la soudaineté d'un passage de l'acte en cours dans l'état, définitif, de la mort. A l'inverse le passé simple de la phrase «La femme du lion mourut» indique le moment de la mort, un aoriste en grec.

nouveau». Traduire ἀπεθάνετε par «vous êtes morts» fait croire que cette mort est simplement un état alors qu'en réalité elle est l'acte, on y insiste, par lequel est inaugurée une vie nouvelle, avec le Christ, et cet acte est précisément annoncé un peu plus haut, 2,20, par le même aoriste ἀπεθάνετε dans une phrase où la présence de la préposition ἀπό oblige à traduire le verbe «mourir» par le substantif «mort»: «s'il est vrai que vous fûtes séparés par la mort des éléments du monde...» (cf. Ga 4,3).

On est ainsi contraint de rendre l'aoriste du grec par le passé simple du français et de recourir à la forme, qui tend à se perdre aujourd'hui, «vous mourûtes». En principe il n'est pas interdit de traduire «car vous mourûtes et votre vie est cachée... en Dieu» ou, mieux peut-être, «car vous êtes morts et voilà que votre vie est cachée... en Dieu». De telles traductions peuvent être admises un instant à la rigueur, mais elles ne sont pas à maintenir parce qu'elles masquent le rapport entre les deux verbes et détruisent le relief de la pensée.

Paul veut dire que la mort au péché coïncide avec la vie cachée en Dieu. Et cela est si bien senti par la *Bible de Jérusalem* qu'elle ajoute, dans la seconde proposition, l'adverbe «désormais»: «Vous êtes morts, et votre vie est désormais cachée avec le Christ en Dieu».

Plutôt cependant qu'ajouter un adverbe de temps, il vaut mieux *sentir*, puisqu'on ne la voit pas, la *subordination* que, dans sa dictée, Paul a mise entre les deux verbes. En fait le premier verbe appartient à une proposition temporelle, qui est dans l'air plus que dans l'écrit, mais n'en est pas moins réelle, selon les usages de la meilleure langue grecque. Bien qu'aucune conjonction de temps ne soit écrite, la première proposition équivaut à une temporelle, comme la seconde est la seule principale; et la preuve en est donnée par la valeur de l'humble conjonction καί, «et», qui relie les deux verbes de valeur inégale⁽⁶⁾.

Ce tour, expliqué dans la note 6, n'est pas inconnu des auteurs du Nouveau Testament, mais la conjonction de temps, ici sous-entendue sous la dictée de Paul, y est exprimée, sans que change la relation entre les verbes.

Ainsi, en ne donnant que la traduction des passages⁽⁷⁾: Luc 2,21, littéralement: «Lorsque furent accomplis huit jours, *et* il reçut le nom de Jésus», c'est-à-dire: «lorsque furent accomplis..., il reçut...»; Luc 19,15:

(6) C'est l'usage de la «parataxe»; elle consiste à coordonner dans la phrase deux propositions logiquement subordonnées l'une à l'autre, la première à la seconde ou la seconde à la première selon le contexte. Cet tour est facilité par la richesse des particules en grec; on le rencontre, depuis Homère, avec un grand nombre de conjonctions, l'enclitique τε, avec μέν, δέ, ἀλλά et le présent καί et souvent en rapport avec des adverbes de temps, comme νῦν, ἄμα, ἤδη, εὐθύς, avec des pronoms, avec des conjonctions, les sens étant rendus plus divers par la présence éventuelle d'une négation. La parataxe peut être rhétorique ou, plus souvent, comme ici, naturelle, lorsque l'auteur s'exprime sans effort, avec un certain laisser-aller, sans souci de rendre visiblement logique le rapport des verbes. Lorsque la parataxe est temporelle elle marque soit une légère postériorité soit, comme ici, la concomitance.

(7) On renvoie aux notes, dans les éditions des Belles Lettres, pour l'*Évangile de Luc* (1976) et pour les *Actes des Apôtres* (1982), et de Gabalda pour l'*Évangile de Jean* (1988).

«Et ce fut au moment de son retour... *et* il ordonna...» (voir aussi 7,12); Ac 1,10: «Comme ils étaient en train de... *et* voici que deux hommes...».

Un exemple de Jean est notable, lorsque Jésus dit, 14,7: ἀπ'αὐτοῦ γινώσκετε (présent) αὐτὸν (le Père) καὶ ἑωράκατε (parfait) αὐτόν, c'est-à-dire, littéralement «à peine le connaissez-vous *et* vous gardez vision de lui». Ce «et» du grec est la conjonction *que* du français, une conjonction qui lie à une temporelle la principale, en indiquant une quasi concomitance des deux idées exprimées par les deux verbes.

La seule différence, dans notre passage, on l'a dit, est que la conjonction de temps n'est, en quelque sorte, que *dans l'air*, et c'est à l'auditeur, ou au lecteur, d'en avoir conscience. On traduira donc: «Dès l'instant que vous mourûtes⁽⁸⁾, votre vie est... cachée en Dieu». Le καὶ a nécessairement disparu en faveur de la conjonction «que»⁽⁹⁾.

Il est temps de revenir à la question posée plus haut et restée en suspens. Quelle est l'explication, donnée par γάρ, «car», de l'impératif qui précède, φρονεῖτε, «tenez dans l'esprit...» les choses d'en haut, et non de la terre? On se rend compte à présent que le verbe premier ἀπεθάνετε n'est pas celui d'une vraie principale et que la vraie principale a pour verbe κέκρυπται, «est cachée».

Il devient clair, dès lors, que l'explication est apportée moins par le premier verbe «vous mourûtes», placé en fait sous les ordres du second, que par ce second verbe lui-même «(votre vie) est cachée». Ainsi sont à exclure, semble-t-il, les traductions du type «car vous mourûtes et votre vie est cachée», en faveur de la phrase plus conforme à la pensée de Paul, «car (virgule), dès l'instant que vous mourûtes (virgule), votre vie est... cachée en Dieu». Si les Colossiens de Paul doivent tenir leur pensée attachée aux choses d'en haut, c'est *parce que*, dès l'instant de leur mort au péché, *leur vie est... cachée* en Dieu. Elle y est cachée σὺν Χριστῷ, «avec le Christ».

Ici se pose un nouveau problème, qui ne touche plus à la structure de la phrase, mais à cette expression «avec le Christ». Est-il suffisant de donner à la préposition σὺν son sens ordinaire d'«avec»?

Le grec en effet possède deux prépositions synonymes, σὺν et le datif, et, avec le génitif, μετά. Elles sont différemment employées par les auteurs du Nouveau Testament, quelquefois indifféremment l'une pour l'autre. Σύν n'est fréquent que chez Luc et Paul, ne se trouve jamais dans l'*Apocalypse* ni dans les Epîtres de Jean, mais apparaît trois fois dans son Evangile, 12,2; 18,1; 21,3. Μετά, suivi du génitif, courant ailleurs, et à peu près trois fois plus fréquent que σὺν dans le Nouveau Testament, est rare chez Paul, et n'est pas concevable ici pour la raison que σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ est une expression particu-

(8) On pourrait songer à un substantif «dès l'instant de votre mort», mais la traduction serait équivoque, en portant à penser qu'il est seulement question de l'état de mort.

(9) Si l'on traduit «à peine êtes-vous morts *que*...», la subordination est inversée mais le sens ne change pas.

lière à l'apôtre. Dénotant une unité de vie avec le Christ, elle convie à ne pas rendre σύν comme un simple μετά⁽¹⁰⁾.

Le sens de l'expression est éclairé par Jésus dans sa prière sacerdotale lorsque, s'adressant au Père, il le prie de garder ceux qui sont dans le monde «dans ton nom», dit-il, «afin qu'ils soient *un* comme nous le sommes» (17,11), et il ajoute, quelques versets plus loin, «afin que tous soient *un*, comme toi, Père, *en* moi, et moi *en* toi...» (17,21). Dans notre passage l'expression, avec la préposition σύν, est renforcée par la présence du préverbe συν- qui met l'accent sur la participation des croyants à la résurrection de Jésus et la reprise de σύν, de nouveau préposition, à côté du pronom αὐτῷ, Jésus, au verset suivant. Il y a une réalité qui est communiquée à ceux qui ont la foi, et cette réalité est celle du Christ; de là l'importance de la formule paulinienne σύν τῷ Χριστῷ, à laquelle il est bon de donner une traduction qui l'écarte du banal «avec»: peut-être «dans l'union au Christ», ou mieux, peut-être encore, en raison de sa simplicité, qui la rend valable dans tous les exemples, «ensemble avec»; elle a l'avantage d'unir une préposition avec un adverbe de même sens.

Verset 4

Le verset 4 conclut le passage, sans offrir de difficulté particulière de traduction. La conjonction ὅταν, suivie du subjonctif, indique le moment à venir où le Christ sera manifesté, et si le verbe φανεροῦν est deux fois employé — au passif — dans ce verset, c'est parce qu'il s'oppose à l'idée d'«être caché».

Ce verset 4 est inséparable des trois versets précédents. Il montre la cohésion de l'ensemble, dont les éléments sont unis par le préverbe initial συν- du verset 1, lequel, on y insiste, commande les deux prépositions σύν des versets 3 et 4. Être caché ensemble *avec* le Christ en Dieu, être manifesté ensemble *avec* lui sont les deux effets de la résurrection *avec* lui⁽¹¹⁾.

En fin de compte, on croit pouvoir adopter pour les quatre versets la version que voici: «1. Si donc il est vrai que vous fûtes avec le Christ res-

⁽¹⁰⁾ Il est à noter que dans le grec littéraire, Xénophon exclu, les prosateurs n'emploient σύν que pour inclure dans une énumération, et davantage en quelques formules usuelles, comme justement σύν θεῷ, ou σύν θεοῖς, mais ces formules profanes excluent toute intimité avec un dieu. La formule σύν Χριστῷ est au contraire particulière à Paul, qui en use douze fois sous des formes diverses, σύν Κυρίῳ, σύν Ἰησοῦ, σύν αὐτῷ (cf. Jn 12,2), Rm 6,8 et 8,32; 2 Co 4,14; 13,4; Ph 1,23; Col 2,13 et 20, puis deux fois dans notre passage. Trois exemples dans 1 Th 4,17; 5,10; en 4,14 Rigaux, dans sa note de l'édition des «Etudes Bibliques» (Paris 1956), commente: «Dieu emmènera... les saints... avec Jésus (= σύν αὐτῷ)... Morts en chrétiens... les défunts ne seront pas séparés de Jésus, Dieu les réunira à lui. C'est l'union au Christ personnel dans la vie, dans la mort, dans la résurrection et dans la glorification qui est déjà dans ce texte».

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf. la phrase de Rm 6,8, qui contient à la fois le préverbe et la préposition, ἐι ἀπεθάνομεν σύν Χριστῷ πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ. Cf. aussi le huitième article du Symbole de Nicée... τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον... τὸ σύν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, où se trouve la même association de la préposition et du préverbe.

suscités, persévérez dans la recherche des choses d'en-haut, là où le Christ se trouve assis à la droite de Dieu; 2. les choses d'en-haut, tenez-les en l'esprit, non pas celles de dessus la terre; 3. car, dès l'instant que vous mourûtes, votre vie est, ensemble avec le Christ, cachée en Dieu. 4. Lorsque le Christ, votre vie, sera manifesté, alors vous aussi, ensemble avec lui, serez manifestés en gloire».

On conclura sur une question. Jamais ailleurs dans le Nouveau Testament, où le verbe κρύπτειν, «cacher», n'est pas rare, on ne trouve l'expression «être caché en Dieu»⁽¹²⁾. Jamais non plus on ne trouve le parfait passif de ce verbe. La forme, qui n'est pas sans exemple dans la Septante, est unique dans le Nouveau Testament. Dire d'une vie qu'elle *est*, ensemble avec le Christ, *cachée en Dieu*, donne une grande force à l'ensemble d'une expression singulière. Dès lors, d'où vient l'idée de recourir au verbe «cacher»? Lorsque Paul écrit aux Colossiens, il est en prison, soustrait ou caché aux regards du monde; il le rappelle deux fois, en écrivant d'abord qu'il *est lié* (4,3), puis en concluant son épître sur les mots: «Souvenez-vous⁽¹³⁾ de mes liens» (4,18).

Dès que les Colossiens sont morts au péché, ressuscités à la vie nouvelle, ne sont-ils pas eux-mêmes, et jusqu'à la manifestation du Christ, comme enfermés, cachés au monde avec lui dans le sein de Dieu?

«la Giride»

F-84210 La Roque sur Pernes

Edouard DELEBECQUE

⁽¹²⁾ Avec la préposition ἐν, il n'y a que des choses cachées dans un champ, ou dans la terre, et deux fois seulement, Mt 13,44 et 25,25 (exemples du même genre, plus nombreux, dans la Septante).

⁽¹³⁾ Ici encore Paul emploie un impératif *présent*, par lequel il invite les Colossiens à *ne pas cesser* de garder en mémoire qu'il se trouve emprisonné.

Una nota sullo specchio di Gc 1,23

Strumento della visione esatta e di quella parziale, immagine della verità e della menzogna, allegoria di Dio e dell'io, dello spirito, del pensiero profondo, della sapienza, della meditazione... lo specchio si presenta con una tale gamma di possibilità interpretative la cui suggestione non ha risparmiato autori antichi e moderni⁽¹⁾ compresi gli scrittori sacri⁽²⁾. Le tre citazioni neotestamentarie dell'immagine in questione hanno avuto una disparità di trattamento a causa della «immediata comprensione» del passo giacobeo rispetto ai più complessi testi paolini. In 1 Cor 13,12 gli studiosi sono abbastanza concordi nel porre l'accento sulla imperfezione della visione che procura lo specchio rispetto alla contemplazione escatologica che si avrà «faccia a faccia», puntando così l'attenzione sul «vedere» e non sullo specchio il quale viene ad assumere una sfumatura negativa. I problemi sorgono invece con 2 Cor 3,18 dove la maggioranza degli esegeti coglie nello specchio una visione indiretta e imperfetta di Dio alla maniera del testo precedente⁽³⁾; altri invece vi leggono un accento posto sulla chiarezza dello specchio: i cristiani porterebbero sul viso il riflesso della gloria di Cristo come Mosè vi

⁽¹⁾ Cf. J. BALTRUŠAITIS, *Le miroir: révélations, science-fiction et fallacies* (Paris 1979). È un'originale storia dell'interpretazione dello specchio ove manca una bibliografia vera e propria, sostituita però adeguatamente da oltre 550 note che riportano più di 500 titoli differenti (... e da 209 deliziose immagini). Gli ambiti di interesse sono svariati e occupano la filosofia, la morale, la religione, la magia, l'alchimia, l'arte, la scienza, la psicanalisi, la letteratura ecc. Il lasso di tempo occupato è il più ampio: va dall'antichità classica fino agli anni nostri. A questa serie impressionante di titoli mi permetterei di aggiungere U. ECO, «Sugli specchi» in *Sugli specchi e altri saggi* (Milano 1985) 9-37, e la traduzione italiana di un'opera già riportata (cap. III n. 54) dallo studioso dell'arte lituano nonché specialista del fantastico, P. VALERY, *Monsieur Teste* (Paris 1958) cui fa seguito un prezioso studio di G. AGAMBEN, «L'io, l'occhio, la voce» (Milano 1988) 101-114.

⁽²⁾ Occorre distinguere i testi in cui viene mostrata la conoscenza dello specchio in quanto oggetto attraverso la semplice presenza del vocabolo (Es 38,8; Gb 37,18; Sap 7,26; Sir 12,11; Is 3,23) da quelli in cui anche senza nominare lo strumento catottrico (in ebraico «specchio» e «visione») hanno la stessa grafia consonantica, ciò ha favorito già nei tempi passati interessanti letture teologiche: cf. R. MIRAMI, *Compendiosa introduzione alla prima parte della specularia* [Ferrara 1585] 2; B. CESI, *Mineralogia sive naturalis philosophiae thesauri* [Lione 1636] 468) se ne dà una interpretazione (Es 34,29-30; Num 12,6). A questo secondo gruppo potrebbe essersi ispirato Paolo e al quale comunque appartengono 1 Cor 13,12; 2 Cor 3,18; Gc 1,23.

⁽³⁾ G. KITTEL, «Αἰνύμα - ἑσπντρον», *TWNT*, I, 177-179; N. HUGEDÉ, *La métaphore du miroir dans les Epîtres de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens* (Neuchâtel 1959).

portava il riflesso della gloria divina⁽⁴⁾. Infine c'è pure chi, cogliendo in Paolo la menzione di un procedimento oracolare pagano, cerca nello specchio magico il destino dell'uomo⁽⁵⁾. Per Gc 1,23 invece tutto sembra più semplice: l'immagine dello specchio appartiene alla diatriba cinico-stoica secondo cui la conoscenza di sé, che appunto offre la visione del proprio volto nello specchio, permette il miglioramento morale. Tale concezione assunta dalla prima lettera cattolica si esprime nella rappresentazione dell'uomo negligente che perde l'occasione per migliorarsi⁽⁶⁾. Da questa posizione che identifica lo «specchio» con la «parola» si dissociano pochi studiosi; tra gli arditi è doveroso annoverare il Reitzenstein il quale — con poco successo — propone l'identità tra lo «specchio» e lo «Spirito» passando per la «legge perfetta della libertà»⁽⁷⁾. Identità che il testo giacobeo esporrebbe in maniera più velata di quanto invece farà agli inizi del IV sec. Zosimo l'alchimista⁽⁸⁾ il quale a sua volta non dipenderebbe dalla lettera di Giacomo ma entrambi da una comune fonte pagano-ellenistica.

Se la tesi del Reitzenstein trova difficoltà ad essere accolta per gli scopi prettamente alchemici di Zosimo che probabilmente allude al testo sacro e non a una fonte pagano-ellenistica e per il discutibile passaggio «specchio» = «legge perfetta» = «Spirito» del testo giacobeo, problemi non meno gravi incontra la tesi comunemente accettata perché l'identità «specchio» «parola» non sembra così ovvia e perché dimenticare la propria immagine non è un'operazione anzitutto di tipo etico. Per cui mi sembra più opportuno dare la parola al testo perché attraverso le sue strutture possa far emergere delle possibilità significanti più logiche, prima ancora di definire l'ambiente di provenienza che finora ha condizionato pesantemente il senso dell'immagine.

⁽⁴⁾ J. DUPONT, «Le chrétien, miroir de la gloire divine, d'après 2 Cor 3,18», *RB* 56 (1949) 392-411. Si ritrova la stessa ipotesi in Erasmo, Lutero, Bachmann, Lietzmann, Plummer, Schlatter, Corssen, Cerfaux, Bonsirven ecc.

⁽⁵⁾ H. ACHELIS, «Katoptromantie bei Paulus», *Theologische Festschrift für G. N. Bonwetsch. Zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstage* (Hrsg. H. ACHELIS, et al.) (Leipzig 1918) 56-63.

⁽⁶⁾ HUGEDÉ, *La métaphore*, 113: «Le fait de se regarder dans un miroir, représente chez Jacques comme chez les autres auteurs de la période hellénistique, l'examen moral qui est à la base de tout perfectionnement de la conduite».

⁽⁷⁾ R. REITZENSTEIN, *Historia monachorum und Historia Lausiaca, eine Studie zur Geschichte des Mönchtums und der frühchristlichen Begriffe Gnostiker und Pneumatiker* (Berlin 1916) 242-255.

⁽⁸⁾ Zosimus Parapolitanus, *Περὶ ἀρετῆς πρὸς Θεοσεβείαν*, Lib. XII. È un trattato alchemico sulle proprietà dell'electrum, un metallo a base di oro e argento che serviva tra le altre cose per la fabbricazione degli specchi. Costruito per primo da Alessandro Magno, lo specchio serviva per proteggere la razza umana dalla folgora che minacciava di sterminarla. I successori del Macedone deposero questo strumento dalle virtù inestimabili nel tempio delle sette porte. «Le miroir n'était pas disposé pour qu'un homme s'y contemplât matériellement; car aussitôt qu'il quittait le miroir, à l'instant il perdait la mémoire de sa propre image. Qu'était-ce donc que ce miroir? Ecoute. Le miroir représente l'Esprit divin. ...» (la traduzione in francese è di M. BERTHELOT, *La chimie au moyen âge* [Paris 1893] II, «L'alchimie syriaque», 262).

Le strutture di Gc 1,22-25

²² Γίνεσθε δὲ ποιηταὶ λόγου καὶ μὴ μόνον ἀκροαταὶ παραλογιζόμενοι ἑαυτοὺς. ²³ ὅτι εἴ τις ἀκροατὴς λόγου ἐστὶν καὶ οὐ ποιητὴς, οὗτος ἔοικεν ἀνδρὶ κατανοοῦντι τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ. ²⁴ κατενόησεν γὰρ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπελήλυθεν καὶ εὐθέως ἐπελάθετο ὁποῖος ἦν. ²⁵ ὁ δὲ παρακύψας εἰς νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ παραμείνας, οὐκ ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς γενόμενος ἀλλὰ ποιητὴς ἔργου οὗτος μακάριος ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ ἔσται.

²² Diventate piuttosto praticanti della parola e non solo uditori, i quali illudono se stessi. ²³ Perché se uno è uditore della parola e non praticante, costui somiglia a un uomo che guarda il proprio volto in uno specchio: ²⁴ infatti si è guardato, se ne è andato e subito ha dimenticato quale era. ²⁵ Chi invece si piega con lo sguardo fisso sulla legge perfetta, quella della libertà, e le resta fedele non come uditore smemorato ma come uno che la pratica, costui sarà felice nel praticarla.

Lo sviluppo antitetico di impostazione diatribica di questi vv., propone un comando composito, prima positivo e poi il contrario negativo al quale fa seguito la conclusione pure negativa. Il tutto viene illustrato da due casi — il secondo dei quali, in armonia col comando, rispecchia la volontà dell'Autore — ordinati in maniera inversa, anch'essi forniti di conseguenza finale che risponde al tono della situazione più vicina: per cui il secondo termine dell'opposizione determina il senso positivo o negativo della conseguenza:

comando: A+ < > B- → C-
 caso 1: B+ < > A- → C-
 caso 2: B- < > A+ → C+

γίνεσθε δὲ ποιηταὶ λόγου... μὴ... ἀκροαταὶ (λόγου)	παραλογιζόμενοι ἑαυτοὺς
ὅτι εἴ τις ἀκροατὴς λόγου... οὐ ποιητὴς (λόγου)	
οὗτος...	ἐπελάθετο ὁποῖος ἦν
ὁ δὲ... οὐκ ἀκροατὴς (λόγου) ἀλλὰ ποιητὴς ἔργου	
οὗτος	μακάριος... ἔσται.

Il δὲ iniziale del comando (v. 22) con la valenza continuativa preannuncia una certa similitudine, o comunque uno stretto rapporto, tra «accogliere» e «praticare», verbi riferiti alla «parola impiantata» (v. 21). L'urgenza (impt. γίνεσθε) a divenire ποιηταὶ λόγου⁽⁹⁾ è qualificata come volontà divina. Opposti a ποιηταί, gli ἀκροαταί hanno lo stesso λόγος per oggetto mentre cambiano i risultati e i modelli proposti:

verbo: fare ascoltare
 oggetto: parola
 risultato: illusione.

(9) C² 88 915 e altri sostituiscono λόγου con νόμου.

Il risultato del solo ascoltare, della parola che resta tale, è l'illusione, un composto di quella stessa parola (*παρалоγιζόμενος*) che se praticata invece porta la salvezza. La competenza umana risiede sul versante dell'azione.

Dopo il comando, il primo caso con cui viene spiegata l'illusione, pur mantenendo uno stretto legame lessicale con quanto precede, è modellato non solo su un ordine inverso, che richiama una forma chiastica, ma soprattutto su uno scenario completamente rovesciato. All'imperativo *γίνεσθε* (v. 22) che esprime il dinamismo e la non ancora realizzazione del comando, si contrappone *ἐστίν* (v. 23) statico nel risultato e nel significato raggiunto, così come a *ποιηταὶ λόγου* e a *μὴ ἀκροαταὶ* viene risposto rispettivamente con *ἀκροατὴς λόγου* e *οὐ ποιητής*. Il caso, iniziato dal soggetto indefinito (*τις*) preceduto dalla ipotetica (*εἰ*) che caratterizza il modo vivace e immediato dell'esprimersi diatribico e che potrebbe denunciare l'origine orale del testo⁽¹⁰⁾, viene spiegato con un esempio la cui struttura va compresa tramite un modello parallelistico:

εἴ τις ἀκροατὴς λόγου οὐ ποιητής
οὗτος κατανοοῦντι πρόσωπον ἐπελάθετο.

Il soggetto costituito del pronome dimostrativo *οὗτος* («costui») è ripetuto all'inizio del paragone in cui il *perfectus-praesens* di *εἶκω* («assomiglia», «è simile») introduce il secondo termine, il «*terminus ad quem*» sempre indefinito, di un procedimento già conosciuto nelle parabole di Gesù (Lc 6,49): «un uomo che guarda il proprio⁽¹¹⁾ volto nello specchio». Se il modello parallelistico funziona, allora «ascoltare» si trova in corrispondenza con «guardare»; i loro rispettivi oggetti sono la «parola» e il «proprio volto» (e non lo «specchio») che si corrispondono, come pure la non-pratica con la perdita di memoria. Se ciò è esatto, l'esempio letto a rovescio verrebbe a significare che la pratica della parola richiama la memoria della propria immagine. Il riferimento alla creazione dell'uomo impostata sull'immagine divina (Gen 1,26) se per un verso sembra necessario, dall'altro offre l'ambientazione adeguata alla formula precedente della «parola impiantata» (v. 21). Il *τῆς γενέσεως* di troppo che rende complessa la formulazione (*τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως* = «il volto della nascita propria»), al di là del richiamo alla

⁽¹⁰⁾ Cf. G. MARCONI, «*Sia ognuno restio a parlare*». *Invito di Giacomo a non parlare di Dio. Egesi di Gc 1,19-27; 3,1-12* (Jesi 1985) 63-67.

⁽¹¹⁾ J. CHAINE, *L'Épître de Saint Jacques* (Paris 1927) xcvi-xcviII considera la ridondanza dei pronomi personali nei casi obliqui come un segno dell'influsso semitico: dove un buon greco avrebbe posto soltanto un articolo, l'ebreo mette un pronome. Però F. BLASS - A. DEBRUNNER, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen 1976) § 278 nota che anche il greco volgare fa uso di tali forme ridondanti. Questa seconda tesi ottiene maggiore credito dall'*ὅποτις* che segue al v. 24, di influsso certamente ellenistico, e dalla confusione tra *οὐ* e *μὴ* davanti a un participio — pure sfumatura ellenistica — che si trova al v. 25 (cf. J. MARTY, *L'Épître de Jacques* [Paris 1935] 232-233). Sempre al v. 25 è invece un ebraismo l'impiego del genitivo di qualità al posto di un aggettivo (*ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς* così pure in 2,14 e 5,15). Probabilmente la lingua popolare parlata — un altro elemento per avvalorare l'ipotesi omiletica — non sa più distinguere i vari influssi e usa indistintamente ciò che è corrente.

propria natura⁽¹²⁾ o più esplicitamente alla vocazione ricevuta da Dio⁽¹³⁾, sembra rinviare alla prima «genesi» (generazione) umana. Nel dire la sua parola, Dio ha creato l'uomo il quale nel praticare quella medesima parola ritrova le radici del proprio essere, per cui non praticandola perde la memoria, si espropria di se stesso. La narrazione del comportamento di chi ha dimenticato passa presto dal volto a tutta la persona: *ἑαυτὸν* è sottolineato anche da *ὁποῖος*. L'aoristo gnomico (*κατενόησεν*) che comporta una situazione tipica risultante dalla narrazione dell'avvenimento⁽¹⁴⁾ lascia supporre che il caso sia molto vicino agli uditori. L'autore è talmente sicuro da conoscere i tempi della dimenticanza: *εὐθέως* («immediatamente») oltre ad essere cronologico è anche amaramente ironico⁽¹⁵⁾. Il volto-parola che ha visto non potrà più illuminare o influire in qualche modo (*ἐπελάθετο* in quanto aoristo definisce l'azione immediatizzandola) nella vita del dimentico che pure continua (*ἀπελήλυθεν* in qualità di perfetto indica la permanenza dello stato)⁽¹⁶⁾.

In questa lettura qual'è la funzione dello specchio? L'esempio in cui è collocato, che si struttura secondo una successione antitetica come il caso a cui è riferito, alla presentazione generale fa seguire una serie di tre azioni: la prima corrisponde a quella generale di cui ripete il verbo, mentre la seconda crea il contrasto tra la prima e la terza. Ridotto in schema si ha la seguente architettura:

ἀνδρὶ κατανοοῦντι τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ
κατανόησεν... ἑαυτὸν
ἀπελήλυθεν
ἐπελάθετο ὁποῖος ἦν.

Perciò sia la strutturazione che la relazione tra immagine e creazione inducono con buone probabilità a pensare allo specchio come al garante della fedeltà e della memoria, e non già alla sua presunta funzione etico-correttiva.

Contesto letterario

Chi ha studiato l'uso della metafora dello specchio nell'antichità ha individuato tre categorie fondamentali in cui ha raggruppato i vari testi⁽¹⁷⁾. La morale stoica comprende lo specchio come strumento della conoscenza di sé.

⁽¹²⁾ A. J. ROPES, *Epistle of St. James* (Edinburgh 1916) 176; M. DIBELIUS, *Der Brief des Jakobus* (Göttingen ¹⁰1964) 148; H. WINDISCH, *Die katholischen Briefe* (Tübingen 1911) 10; P. H. DAVIDS, *The Epistle of James. A Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London 1982) 98.

⁽¹³⁾ E. M. SIDEBOTTOM, *James, Jude and 2 Peter* (London 1967) 35.

⁽¹⁴⁾ BLASS - DEBRUNNER, §§ 412-413.

⁽¹⁵⁾ A. URBAN - J. MATEOS - M. ALEPUZ, *Cuestiones de gramática y léxico* (Madrid 1977) 137-138.

⁽¹⁶⁾ J. MATEOS, *El aspecto verbal en el Nuevo Testamento* (Madrid 1977) 95: «El aspecto morfológico propio del perfecto se traduce, en los LexInsts (efectivos), en la *permanencia* o *definitividad* de un estado o situación creada por la acción instantánea puntual».

⁽¹⁷⁾ J. BEHM, «Das Bildwort vom Spiegel 1 Korinther 13,12», *Reinhold-Seeberg-Festschrift* (Hrsg. W. KOEPP) (Leipzig 1929) I, 315-342; per il nostro scopo

Viene usato per guardarsi, ma la conoscenza che procura può superare quella esclusivamente materiale (cf. il socratico γνῶθι σεαυτόν). Conoscersi è il principio che sta alla base di ogni progresso morale di cui lo specchio è strumento⁽¹⁸⁾. In quanto permette la conoscenza attraverso il «far vedere», lo specchio è anche simbolo di chiarezza, e grazie alla sua trasparenza è stato interpretato come strumento di fedeltà al vero⁽¹⁹⁾. Però in qualità del suo essere «instrumentum», è pure una forma di mediazione per cui la visione che procura indica una conoscenza indiretta nella quale si può afferrare solo l'immagine dell'oggetto e non l'oggetto in sé⁽²⁰⁾.

Pur accettando in linea di massima questa divisione tripartita, non sempre i confini tra le varie tematiche sono risultati così chiari, né sono mancati esempi di contatti fra di esse⁽²¹⁾. Anche in Gc 1,23 mi sembra si possa ipotizzare l'incontro di due tendenze, quella più stoica della conoscenza di sé e quella dell'immagine chiara. Infatti nel testo «cattolico» si afferma il carattere ri-conoscitivo, quindi non può che trattarsi della visione vera dell'io auto-vedente e autoriconoscente. Se poi, come sembra, non si tratta solo della visione esterna, ma della propria identità che corrisponde all'immagine di Dio, allora l'immagine speculare, impossibilitata segnicamente, dice la verità in senso assoluto.

Conclusione

Le correlazioni architettoniche interne al brano hanno dimostrato quanto Giacomo sia libero dagli schemi sempre troppo rigidi di un'unica scuo-

cf. le pp. 328-335; J. DUPONT, *Gnosis. La connaissance religieuse dans les épîtres de Saint Paul* (Bruges - Paris 1949) 121-133; HUGEDÉ, *La métaphore*, 98-137.

⁽¹⁸⁾ L. A. Seneca, *Naturalium quaestionum*, I, 17, 4 (ed. P. OLTRAMARE) (Paris 1929): «Inventa sunt specula ut homo ipse se nosset, multa ex hoc consecuturus, primum sui notitiam, deinde ad quaedam consilium: formosus, ut vitaret infamiam; deformis, ut sciret redimendum esse virtutibus quicquid corpori deesset...». La stessa idea si ritrova anche in *De Clementia*, I,1; *De Ira*, II,36,1. Cf. Diogenes Laertius, *De clarorum philosophorum vitis, dogmatibus et apophthegmatibus libri decem*, II,33; III,39; T. M. Plautus, *Epidicus*, 382-389; *Adelphoe*, 413-420.426-429; A. Phaedrus, *Fabulae Aesopiae*, III,8,14-16; Epictetus, *Dissertationes*, II,14,21; Philo Alexandrinus, *De migratione Abrahami*, 98; *De vita Mosis*, II,139; *De Josepho*, 87; *De specialibus legibus*, I,219.

⁽¹⁹⁾ L. Apuleius, *De apologia*, 14,8; Plato, *Timaeus*, 72c; M. T. Cicero, *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, II,10,32; V,22,61. In 1 Clem 32,6 Cristo è lo specchio ove noi vediamo e contempliamo Dio: διὰ τούτου (Cristo) ἀτενίζομεν εἰς τὰ ὕψι τῶν οὐρανῶν, διὰ τούτου ἐνοπτρίζομεθα τὴν ἁμῶν καὶ ὑπερτάτην ὄψιν αὐτοῦ (Dio)...

⁽²⁰⁾ Plato, *De Republica*, X,596 E; *Timaeus*, 71b; *Sophista*, 239d.240a-b; *Theaetetus*, 206d; *Phaedrus*, 255d; *Phaedo*, 99d; Philo Alexandrinus, *De Decalogo*, 105; *Legum allegoriae*, III,101; *De specialibus legibus*, I,26; *De somnis*, II,206; *De opificio mundi*, 76; Plotinus, *Enneades*, III,6,7.13; Plutarchus, *De Iside et Osiride*, 76; *De genio Socratis*, 22; L. A. Seneca, *Naturalium quaestionum*, I,4,2; I,5,1; I,6,4; I,15,7-8; I,17,1; L. Apuleius, *De apologia*, XIV,1.

⁽²¹⁾ Philo Alexandrinus, *De Abrahamo*, 153 unisce il tema della chiarezza con quello della visione indiretta: ὡς συνελόντι φράσαι ψυχῆς εἰκόνα δεδημιουργησθαι τὴν ὄρασιν ἀκρότητι τέχνης εὐ μεμιμημένης ἐναργῆς ἐμφαίνουσας εἰδῶλον οἷα διὰ κατόπτρου τὴν φύσιν ὁρατὴν ἐξ αὐτῆς οὐκ ἐχούσης.

la. Le sue capacità «eclettiche» hanno saputo armonizzare nella immagine dello specchio, comune nella letteratura classica, due interpretazioni correnti che, rimosse dal piano etico-estetico e trasferite a quello più spiccatamente antropo-teologico, hanno conferito valore di autentica novità all'immagine stessa.

Seminario Vescovile
via L. Lotto, 14
60035 Jesi (An) Italia

Gilberto MARCONI

Additional Notes on "The Last Words of David" (2 Sam 23,1-7)

In a recent article in this journal I advanced the theory that the poem entitled "The Last Words of David" in 2 Sam 23,1-7 was a northern composition⁽¹⁾. I based this conclusion on the fact that these seven verses include six non-normative Hebrew usages which either are paralleled in Aramaic, Phoenician, and Ugaritic, or are to be found elsewhere in the Bible only in other northern texts. Accordingly, this poem is one of the outstanding samples of Israelian Hebrew (IH)⁽²⁾ preserved in the biblical corpus⁽³⁾.

In the present note I wish to put forward two additional points which bolster my hypothesis. One is another indication of IH, namely the use of the root *n'm*, and the other is a shared literary motif with the Deir 'Alla inscription.

I. The Root *n'm*

In v. 1 of the poem we encounter the expression *n'e'im z'mîrôt yisrâ'el*, traditionally rendered "the sweet singer of Israel" (thus *JPSV*)⁽⁴⁾. The word *n'e'im* comes from the root *n'm* meaning "sweet, pleasant, good, lovely, delightful, etc."⁽⁵⁾. Although this root is relatively rare in Hebrew, it is the normal word for "good, sweet, pleasant, etc." in Ugaritic and Phoenician⁽⁶⁾.

⁽¹⁾ G. A. RENDBURG, "The Northern Origin of 'The Last Words of David' (2 Sam 23,1-7)", *Bib* 69 (1988) 113-121.

⁽²⁾ I have coined this term based on H. L. GINSBERG, *The Israelian Heritage of Judaism* (New York 1982).

⁽³⁾ I have collected a large amount of material describing IH in G. A. RENDBURG, "Morphological Evidence for Regional Dialects in Ancient Hebrew", *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew* (W. BODINE, ed.) (Winona Lake, IN, forthcoming).

⁽⁴⁾ Recently scholars have suggested that the second word in this phrase should not be connected with the root "sing" (PS *zmr*), rather it should be related to the root "protect, strong" (PS *dmr*). For complete discussion see P. K. MCCARTER, *II Samuel* (AB 9; Garden City, NY 1984) 480. However one sides on this issue is of no ultimate consequence for our present concern; on the other hand see below, n. 19.

⁽⁵⁾ BDB, 653; and KB, 622.

⁽⁶⁾ For the Ugaritic documentation and for a general statement on *n'm* in Ugaritic and Phoenician, see C. H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome 1967) 445. Although it is not listed as such, I would add *n'm* to the list of lexicographical

As an indication of its common usage in Phoenician, I would point out that R. S. Tombaek lists 13 occurrences of *n'm* in his lexicon⁽⁷⁾. By comparison, in a much larger corpus of literature, note that *n'm* occurs only 30 times in the Bible. Furthermore, *n'm* is a fairly common element in Phoenician personal names⁽⁸⁾. In addition, *n'mn* is the Phoenician name for Adonis⁽⁹⁾, and the same name is borne by one of the leading Aramean characters in the Bible, the general Naaman (2 Kgs 5). Moreover, the word *n'm* appears in Egyptian hieratic script in Papyrus Anastasi I, column 23, line 5, in the midst of a discussion concerning northern Canaan in general, with specific mention of Megiddo and Asher in the adjoining lines⁽¹⁰⁾. All of this suggests that the root *n'm* was common in areas to the north of Israel, Phoenicia in particular but perhaps Aram as well.

More importantly, of the 30 biblical occurrences of *n'm*, the vast majority occurs in texts where northern origin is likely. Nine times *n'm* occurs in Proverbs⁽¹¹⁾, twice it appears in Song of Songs (1,16; 7,7)⁽¹²⁾, and once it is used in Job (36,11)⁽¹³⁾. It is attested to ten times in Psalms. Of these, two are in Ps 16, 6.11, one occurs in Ps 81,3, one occurs in Ps 133,1, and two are in Ps 141,4.6. These are all northern compositions, as the following details demonstrate.

features distinguishing Phoenic from Hebraic according to the classification system of H. L. GINSBERG, "The Northwest Semitic Languages", *Patriarchs* (B. MAZAR, ed.) (The World History of the Jewish People, II; Tel-Aviv 1970) 105.

⁽⁷⁾ R. S. TOMBACK, *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages* (Missoula, MT 1978) 215-217. This work is only a dictionary, not a concordance of the Phoenician inscriptions. Additional instances of the root *n'm* are to be found in the corpus of Phoenician and Punic epigraphic remains.

⁽⁸⁾ F. L. BENZ, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions* (Rome 1972) 102, 146-147, 176, 185, 362.

⁽⁹⁾ See W. F. ALBRIGHT, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (London 1968) 186-187.

⁽¹⁰⁾ For text, translation, and notes, see A. H. GARDINER, *Egyptian Hieratic Texts* (Leipzig 1911) 25*, 68.

⁽¹¹⁾ The northern affinities of Proverbs have been discussed by W. F. ALBRIGHT, "Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom", *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East* (M. NOTH and D. W. THOMAS, eds.) (VTS 3; Leiden 1960) 1-15; GINSBERG, *The Israelian Heritage of Judaism*, 36; and Y. AVISHUR, *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs in Biblical and Ancient Semitic Literatures* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984) 440, and his reference in n. 6. See also RENDSBURG, "Northern Origin", 117.

⁽¹²⁾ The subject of the northern origin of the Song of Songs merits further research. See, however, S. R. DRIVER, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York 1906) 448-449; M. H. POPE, *Song of Songs* (AB 7C; Garden City, NY 1977) 33-34, 362; Y. AVISHUR, "Le-Ziqā ha-Signonit ben Shir ha-Shirum ve-Sifrut 'Ugarit", *Beth Mikra* 59 (1974) 508-525; and AVISHUR, *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs*, 440.

⁽¹³⁾ On Job as a northern composition see D. N. FREEDMAN, "Orthographic Peculiarities in the Book of Job", *Eretz-Israel* 9 (W. F. Albright Volume) (1969) 35-44.

Psalms 16 contains numerous features of IH⁽¹⁴⁾: four attestations of the negative particle *bal*⁽¹⁵⁾; the orthography *'mrt* for *'amartî* "I said" (v. 2)⁽¹⁶⁾; two examples of the preservation of the feminine nominal ending *-āt* (vv. 5 and 6)⁽¹⁷⁾; the root *špr* "pleasing, beautiful" (v. 6) which is standard in Aramaic but rare in Hebrew⁽¹⁸⁾; the form *šēmāhôt* (v. 11), meaning "joy" in the singular not the plural⁽¹⁹⁾, reflecting the Phoenician shift of short *a* to *o*⁽²⁰⁾; and the parallel word-pair *n'm* and *šb'* (v. 11) which is unique in the Bible but is well-known from the Phoenician inscription of King Azitawadda⁽²¹⁾.

Psalms 81 has long been recognized as a northern composition⁽²²⁾. One of the key markers in this chapter is the term *bîhōšēp* "in Joseph", which has both substantive and linguistic implications. A reference to Joseph automatically flags the poem as a northern text, and the non-elision of the *he* in this form is another element of IH⁽²³⁾. Furthermore, the word *keseh* (v. 4) is rare in Hebrew⁽²⁴⁾ but it has cognates in Phoenician and Ugaritic⁽²⁵⁾; ac-

⁽¹⁴⁾ M. DAHOOD, *Psalms I* (AB 16; Garden City, NY 1965) 87, noted that "the language and style are peculiarly Phoenician". AVISHUR, *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs*, 461, stated that Psalm 16 "contains a large Canaanite, and especially Phoenician substrate". I would simply alter these judgments by stating that the chapter was written by a north Israelite poet whose Hebrew dialect included many isoglosses with Phoenician.

⁽¹⁵⁾ See RENDSBURG, "Northern Origin", 117 and n. 31.

⁽¹⁶⁾ DAHOOD, *Psalms I*, 87.

⁽¹⁷⁾ See RENDSBURG, "Morphological Evidence".

⁽¹⁸⁾ The other two biblical attestations are in Gen 49,21 and Job 26,13. The former appears in Jacob's blessing to Naphtali, one of the northernmost tribes, and the latter appears in a book with much Aramaic coloring. I exclude from consideration the noun *šaprîrô* "his canopy (?)" in Jer 43,10, which may or may not be related to our root.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Elsewhere this form occurs only in Ps 45,16, which virtually all scholars recognize as a northern composition. Thus C. A. BRIGGS, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh 1906) 384; H. GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen* (Göttingen 1926) 193; M. D. GOULDER, *The Psalms of the Sons of Korah* (Sheffield 1982); etc. For other examples of feminine singular nouns ending in *-ôt*, see RENDSBURG, "Morphological Evidence". Some scholars have understood *z'mîrôt* in 2 Sam 23,1 as singular, to be translated either "song" or "stronghold"; see MCCARTER, *II Samuel*, 477, 480. I do not necessarily accept this interpretation, but if it is correct then there would be still another IH element in "The Last Words of David".

⁽²⁰⁾ J. FRIEDRICH and W. RÖLLIG, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik* (Rome 1970) 29-30, 106-107. The length of the *o* vowel is unclear. For full discussion of all the pertinent data, notwithstanding a contrary conclusion, see A. DOTAN, "Stress Position and Vowel Shift in Phoenician and Punic", *Israel Oriental Studies* 6 (1976) 71-121.

⁽²¹⁾ AVISHUR, *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs*, 452, 461.

⁽²²⁾ GUNKEL, *Psalmen*, 359; GINSBERG, *The Israelian Heritage of Judaism*, 31-32; S. LOEWENSTAMM, "'ēdūt bîhōšēp", *Eretz-Israel* 5 (B. Mazar Volume) (1958) 80-82; and M. J. BUSS, "The Psalms of Asaph and Korah", *JBL* 82 (1963) 382-392.

⁽²³⁾ RENDSBURG, "Northern Origin", 116.

⁽²⁴⁾ Elsewhere it occurs only in Prov 7,20 (where it is spelled *kese'*) in a section replete with northernisms; see above n. 11.

⁽²⁵⁾ See M. DAHOOD, *Psalms II* (AB 17; Garden City, NY 1968) 264.

cordingly it must have been a feature of IH but not of Judahite Hebrew in which the great majority of the Bible is composed.

Psalms 133 is another poem with northern affinities⁽²⁶⁾. Not only does the poem mention Mt. Hermon, but it contains two important characteristics of IH. These are the relative particle *še-* (v. 3)⁽²⁷⁾; and the reduplicatory plural *harêrê* "mountains of" (v. 3)⁽²⁸⁾.

Psalms 141 has been thoroughly treated by R. Tournay who cited many Phoenicianisms in the poem⁽²⁹⁾, and by M. Dahood, who specified "the Phoenician territory as the probable place of this poem's composition"⁽³⁰⁾. These include *dal* "door" (v. 3), *išim* "men" (v. 4), *bal* "not" (v. 4), and *man'ammêhem* "their delicacies" (v. 4) (with our root *n'm*). To these terms add the following IH elements: the use of the root *lhm* "eat" (v. 4)⁽³¹⁾; and the form *yānî* "my wine" (v. 5) reflecting monophthongization of *ay* > *ā*⁽³²⁾.

Other instances of *n'm* also have northern connections. Gen 49,15 is Jacob's blessing to Issachar, one of the northern tribes. Isa 17,10 appears in the address to Damascus and Ezek 32,19 appears in the address to Egypt. In these two instances it is more than probable that style-switching or code-switching is operating. This is a rhetorical device, recently studied by S. A. Kaufman, in which biblical writers (and particularly the prophets) produced "intentional stylistic representations" of the speech of Israel's neighbors⁽³³⁾.

⁽²⁶⁾ GUNKEL, *Psalmen*, 571.

⁽²⁷⁾ E. Y. KUTSCHER, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem 1982) 32.

⁽²⁸⁾ E. Y. KUTSCHER, "Ha-Šafa ha-'Ivrit u-Venot Liwyata be-Meshek ha-Dorot", *Hadoar* 47 (1968-69) 507-509 [reprinted in E. Y. KUTSCHER, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies* (Jerusalem 1977)]; and RENDSBURG, "Morphological Evidence".

⁽²⁹⁾ R. TOURNAY, "Le psaume cxli", *VT* 9 (1959) 63. For an earlier statement, though with no supporting evidence, see the opinion of H. L. Ginsberg cited by W. F. ALBRIGHT, "Recent Progress in North-Canaanite Research", *BASOR* 70 (1938) 23-24, n. 22.

⁽³⁰⁾ M. DAHOOD, *Psalms III* (AB 17A; Garden City, NY 1970) 309.

⁽³¹⁾ RENDSBURG, "Northern Origin", 117 and n. 32.

⁽³²⁾ Note that the word *yānî* "my wine" is parallel to *šemen* "oil", as is also the case in Amos 6,6; Mic 6,15; Ps 104,15; Cant 1,2-3; 4,10 (see also Deut 28,39-40; Prov 21,17; 2 Chr 11,11; for Ugaritic examples see *UT* 126:III:15-16; 128:IV:4-5; 128:IV:15-16). See further AVISHUR, *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs*, 367-368. For extended discussion of *yānî* in Ps 141,5, see G. A. RENDSBURG, "Monophthongization of *aw/ay* > *ā* in Eblaite and in Northwest Semitic", *Eblaite: Essays on the Ebla Archives and the Eblaite Language*, Vol. 2 (C. H. GORDON and G. A. RENDSBURG, eds.) (Winona Lake, IN, forthcoming).

⁽³³⁾ S. A. KAUFMAN, "The Classification of the North West Semitic Dialects of the Biblical Period and Some Implications Thereof", *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Panel Sessions: Hebrew and Aramaic Languages) (Jerusalem 1988) 55. See also N. H. TUR-SINAI, "'Aramit: Hashpa'at ha-'Aramit 'al ha-'Ivrit shel ha-Miqra'", *Enšiqlopediya Miqra'it* 1 (1965) 593-594; J. C. GREENFIELD, "Aramaic Studies and the Bible", *Congress Volume Vienna 1980* (J. A. EMERTON, ed.) (VTS 32; Leiden 1981) 129-130; and G. A. RENDSBURG, "Bilingual Wordplay in the Bible", *VT* 38 (1988) 356.

Isaiah's phraseology *nit'ê na'āmānīm*, literally "plants of pleasantness" (thus *JPSV*) but more idiomatically "plant-beds of Adonis", is especially striking because a) it uses the root *n'm*; b) it demonstrates a knowledge of pagan concepts⁽³⁴⁾; and c) it involves the syntagma of a "double plural" (both *nomen regens* and *nomen rectum* are plural) which S. Gevirtz recognized as a northern phenomenon⁽³⁵⁾. As far as Ezekiel is concerned, it is true that Egypt (and not a northern setting) is involved. However, given the close ties between Egypt and Byblos from at least the 3rd Millennium BCE, whatever Canaanite may have been known in Egypt was probably of the Phoenician dialectal type. Thus I would suggest that the prophet tinged his Hebrew with a northern feature such as the root *n'm* in addressing Egypt.

With four usages of *n'm* the connections with northern Israel are not as evident, but even with these some ties may be possible. The two passages in David's lament over Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam 1,16,26) are admittedly from the pen of a Judahite poet, but the setting is Gilboa and the two slain heroes are Benjaminites⁽³⁶⁾. Finally, the two cases in Zech 11,7,10, are either to be explained as northern influence over post-Exilic Hebrew⁽³⁷⁾, or as continuations of the address to Lebanon in 11,1-3.

If we now add our example from 2 Sam 23,1, maximally 26 of 30 or minimally 22 of 30 usages of the root *n'm* in the Bible are in northern texts⁽³⁸⁾.

(34) ALBRIGHT, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, 186-187.

(35) S. GEVIRTZ, "Of Syntax and Style in the 'Late Biblical Hebrew' — 'Old Canaanite' Connection", *JANES* 18 (1986) 28-29; and S. GEVIRTZ, "Asher in the Blessing of Jacob (Genesis xlix 20)", *VT* 37 (1987) 160.

(36) Benjamin is, of course, only a few miles north of Judah and Jerusalem, but as the modern study of dialect geography teaches us, this is no reason to assume that the same variety of Hebrew was spoken in the two locales. In modern Israel, for example, trained speakers of colloquial Arabic can often pinpoint the locale of a particular speaker to his village. In Great Britain this is a popular sport as well, and the Henry Higgins character of George Bernard Shaw fame is not as great an exaggeration as it may seem. See Shaw's "Preface to *Pygmalion*: A Professor of Phonetics" in *Pygmalion* (Baltimore 1951) 7-10. Moreover, I have detected several IH features in the stories of Saul and Samuel set in the territory of Benjamin and Ephraim; see RENDSBURG, "Morphological Evidence".

(37) On this phenomenon see C. H. GORDON, "North Israelite Influence on Postexilic Hebrew", *IEJ* 5 (1955) 85-88; and KUTSCHER, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, 55.

(38) The four passages not referred to thus far are Ps 27,4; 90,17; 135,3; 147,1. There is neither a concentration of northern forms in these poems nor mention of northern geographical terms. Accordingly, these psalms probably are Judahite in origin. In all of these cases, however, I think we can understand why the particular poet chose to use the root *n'm*. In the two cases of Ps 135,3; 147,1, *nā'im* serves as the B-word for the much more common A-word *îōb*. On this phenomenon see G. R. DRIVER, "Hebrew Poetic Diction", *Congress Volume Copenhagen 1953* (VTS 1; Leiden 1953) 26-39. In Ps 90,17 *nō'am* acts to cement a most interesting inclusio with Ps 90,1. The last verse of the poem begins with the phrase *nō'am 'ādōnāy*, while the first words of the poem (following the superscription) are *'ādōnāy mā'ôn*. Note that *nō'am* and *mā'ôn* are palindromes of each other, involving both consonants and vowels. On the inclusio in general see DAHOOD, *Psalms II*, 322, 327. Finally, Ps 27,4 presumably

I consider this a significant ratio⁽³⁹⁾. Coupled with the Phoenician and Ugaritic evidence, I conclude that *n'm* was commonly used in IH, and only very rarely employed in the dialect of Judah. Accordingly, it serves as a seventh point in favor of my earlier conclusion concerning the northern origin of "The Last Words of David".

II. A Shared Motif with the Deir 'Alla Text

Kaufman has not only alerted scholars to the phenomenon of style-switching in his aforementioned article, he has also detected an interesting parallel between the Deir 'Alla (DA) text and our poem. I quote him in full:

But I think the visions and oracles of Balaam recorded in the DA text have another echo in the Bible, in the "last words of David" (II Sam. 23:1-7). That this cryptic oracle is introduced by the same phrase (*n'm* PN *wn'm hgbr*) that begins the oracle of Balaam has always been evident. But what is the connection between the two texts? When we read in David's last words the line: *ûke'ôr bôqer yizrah šameš bôqer lô' 'âbôt minnôgah mimmâfâr deše' mē'âreṣ: kî lô' kēn bēti 'îm 'êl...* a line that sounds as if it were lifted right out of the DA text, the connection becomes clear. Note especially the phrase *lô' 'âbôt*, the emphasis on light (*ngh*!) vs. darkness (antithetic to DA) and the appearance of the divine appellation *'l*⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Little needs to be added to this clear statement. It is true that the contrast between light and darkness is a universal literary motif. That is to say, not only the author of the Deir 'Alla text and the northern poet responsible for 2 Sam 23,1-7 could use this imagery, but obviously a writer in Jerusalem could do so just as easily. Thus, we should be careful not to conclude that the emphasis on light vs. darkness is automatically a non-Judahite feature. However, in so far as the two texts use *ngh* "light", *'b-* "cloud", and *'l* "God/El", Kaufman is certainly correct to relate their common phraseology. In a concluding note to my earlier article on 2 Sam 23,1-7 I ventured "the possibility that the poem stems from Mahanaim in Trans-Jordan"⁽⁴¹⁾. In light of the connections made by Kaufman, the short distance between Deir 'Alla and Mahanaim (about 18 km.) may support this suggestion.

Department of Near Eastern Studies
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853 U.S.A.

Gary A. RENDSBURG

uses *b'nô' am yhwh* as a variant to *b'tûb yhwh* in Ps 27,13. See further DAHOOD, *Psalms I*, 167, 170.

⁽³⁹⁾ Compare the methodology employed by M. TSEVAT, *A Study of the Language of the Biblical Psalms* (Philadelphia 1955).

⁽⁴⁰⁾ KAUFMAN, "Classification", 54.

⁽⁴¹⁾ RENDSBURG, "Northern Origin", 121, n. 55.

Psalm 104,13b:

"The Earth is Satisfied with the Fruit of Thy Works"*

It has often been asserted that the words *p̄rī ma'āšēkā*, "the fruit of thy works", do not suit the context in Ps 104,13. Several proposals have been made for emendation⁽¹⁾, most of them considerably deviating from the Massoretic text, and none of them quite convincing. In my opinion the handed-down text of Ps 104,13b does make sense and, besides, is a central element in the passage involved.

I

The phrase *p̄rī ma'āšīm*, though standing alone in the Hebrew Bible, has parallels in *p̄rī ma'ālālim*, "fruit of deeds" (Isa 3,10; Jer 17,10; 21,14; 32,19; Mic 7,13), and *p̄rī derek*, "fruit of way [of acting]" (Prov 1,31). In the latter phrases *p̄rī* is used as a metaphor denoting "result", "product", "effect"⁽²⁾, and obviously this is the case in Ps 104,13 as well⁽³⁾. It may

* Where no book-title is mentioned, the author's commentary on Psalms is intended. Italics attached to verse numbers are to indicate stichs within the verse, without regard to the Massoretic division.

(1) J. DYSERINCK, *Kritische Scholiën bij de vertaling van het Boek der Psalmen* (Leiden 1878) 15: *mipp̄rī n̄šī'ēkā*, "with the fruit of thy clouds"; T. K. CHEYNE (1904): *mēr̄sīsēkā*, "from thy showers" (?); C. A. BRIGGS (ICC; 1907): *mipp̄r-āšayw*, "by his outbursts of water"; K. BUDDE, "Zum Text der Psalmen", *ZAW* 35 (1915) 192: *mērī šamayim*, "with the moisture of heaven"; B. DUHM (KHC XIV; 1922): *mippakkāyw*, "from his flasks"; H. GUNKEL (HKAT II/2; 1926): *mērī 'āsāmēkā*, "with the moisture of thy storehouses"; R. KITTEL (KAT XIII; 1929): *minn̄šī'ēkā*, "from thy clouds"; H. SCHMIDT (HAT I/15; 1934): *mērī šāmēkā*, "with the moisture of thy heaven"; H. HERKENNE (HS V/2; 1936): *mimmārē šē'rēkā*, "with the drops of thy showers" (cf. Isa 40,15; Deut 32,2); G. CASTELLINO (1955): *mē'ārōp šāmēkā*, "by the dripping of thy heavens"; A. WEISER (ATD XV; 1963): *mipp̄rī šāmēkā*, "with the fruit (gift) of thy heaven".

(2) Cf. E. KÖNIG, *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik in Bezug auf die biblische Literatur* (Leipzig 1900) 97. In Prov 8,19; 18,20 *p̄rī* is used in parallel with *ēbū'ā*, "yield".

(3) L. C. ALLEN thinks "it is difficult to take פרי "fruit" figuratively in this context of natural phenomena" (Word Bibl. Comm. XXI [1983] 27). However, the use of *p̄rī* as a metaphor must have been very current, as appears from its frequency in the OT. In view of the usage in Prov 12,14; 13,2; 18,20; 31,16.31, we may say that the phrase "the fruit of thy works" is simple and could hardly be misunderstood, not even in the context of Ps 104. — *ma'āšēkā*, referring to God's acting, is generally a plural. We may take it as a plural in *p̄rī ma'āšēkā*

be noted that *p̄rī*, used in a figurative sense, is connected with *šb'*, "be satisfied", in Prov 12,14; 18,20 — as it is in Ps 104,13; in other, comparable texts (Isa 3,10; Hos 10,13; Prov 1,31; 13,2; 18,21) *p̄rī* is joined to *'kl*, "eat". One has the impression that in wisdom literature the junction of "fruit" (in a figurative sense) and "eat" or "be satisfied" was much appreciated.

The foregoing implies that in Ps 104,13 God's "works" are not (as in vv. 24 and 31) parts or elements of the created world⁽⁴⁾, but rather his actions or deeds.

II

Even if the meaning of *p̄rī ma'āšīm* is clear, the question remains what is the purport of the statement "the earth is satisfied with the fruit of thy works".

It is frequently supposed that the clause is all but synonymous with v. 13a, "he waters the mountains from his upper chambers"⁽⁵⁾. Now, indeed, there is parallelism between the two stichs of v. 13: *hārīm*, "mountains", and *'ereš*, "earth", could be a word-pair, as is the case in, e.g., v. 32⁽⁶⁾; *mašqeh*, "watering", is balanced by *tišba'*, "is satisfied". On the other hand *p̄rī*, as a metaphor, is not very appropriate to denote one concrete matter (viz. the water from heaven, v. 13a), nor is *ma'āšēkā*, "thy works"⁽⁷⁾, likely to refer only to the watering of the mountains. In this connection it may be observed that in itself the concept *'ereš* is broader than *hārīm*: apart from including the valleys and the planes⁽⁸⁾, *'ereš* can also be used metonymically to indicate the inhabitants of the earth⁽⁹⁾; in several places it denotes the earth together with the creatures upon it⁽¹⁰⁾. There is reason to suppose that in our text, too, the word is used in the latter sense.

The assumption that the two stichs of Ps 104,13, although semantically related, are not of the same order, is supported by formal aspects, viz. the transition from 3rd to 2nd person, which betrays awe (cf. v. 24)⁽¹¹⁾; the transition from participle to finite verb; and the change of subject.

too, the more so if we consider the phrase *p̄rī ma'ālālīm*. Cf. H. BAUER — P. LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache* (Halle 1922) 585c.

⁽⁴⁾ Such as heaven or the clouds: thus E. F. C. ROSENMÜLLER, *Scholia in Psalmos* (Lipsiae 1831); E. W. HENGSTENBERG (²1852); R. TOURNAY — R. SCHWAB (Sainte Bible de Jérusalem; ³1964).

⁽⁵⁾ The heavenly upper chambers are mentioned in v. 3, where it is said that they are built "in the waters" or "of the waters"; cf. C. HOUTMAN, *De hemel in het Oude Testament* (Franeker 1974) 183. See also Gen 1,7; 7,11; Deut 33,28; 2 Kgs 7,2; Zech 8,12; Mal 3,10; Ps 148,4.

⁽⁶⁾ See also e.g. Ps 46,3; 95,4; 147,8; Isa 14,25; 18,6.

⁽⁷⁾ See above, n. 3.

⁽⁸⁾ See v. 5.8 and e.g. Deut 1,7-8.

⁽⁹⁾ See e.g. Gen 19,31; 1 Kgs 2,2; Ps 66,1.4; 82,8.

⁽¹⁰⁾ See Exod 19,5; Joel 2,10; Nah 1,5; Ps 69,35; 96,11; Prov 30,21.

⁽¹¹⁾ See KÖNIG, *Stilistik*, 243.

III

The content of Ps 104,13b may be paraphrased as follows: the earth and all creatures upon it are satisfied with the things prepared through thy works⁽¹²⁾. Let us consider this statement in its wider context.

It is generally assumed, and rightly so, that v. 10 is the beginning of a new passage, and likewise v. 19. Several commentators and translations suppose there is a caesura after v. 12 too. This, however, is questionable in view of the contents of vv. 13-18, which clearly relate to those of vv. 10-12; see especially vv. 10 and 13 (the gift of water), vv. 11a and 13a (*šqḥ*), and vv. 12 and 17 (the birds in the trees). In this connection, the successive use of the participle with and without the article (vv. 10,13,14) is also significant. In hymnic statements on YHWH the two forms are apt to express different points of view⁽¹³⁾: the participle with the article emphatically refers to YHWH as a subject, explicitly attributing an action to him (see vv. 3,32; Ps 66,9; 103,3-5; 113,5,6; 146,6b; 147,3a,15,16)⁽¹⁴⁾; without the article, the participle may suggest coherence, introducing a statement on YHWH that supplements or elaborates a former one (see v. 2; Ps 18,34,35,49; 46,10; 113,7,9; 135,7; 146,7; 147,11)⁽¹⁵⁾. The usage in Ps 104,10ff. fits in with this pattern. The participle of v. 10 emphatically ascribes an action to YHWH at the beginning of a new passage. The participles of vv. 13 and 14 introduce statements supplementing that of v. 10: he that makes the springs gush forth in the valleys⁽¹⁶⁾ also sends the rain upon the mountains and makes the vegetation grow. So, apparently, vv. 10-18 are one coherent passage⁽¹⁷⁾, in which the motif of the water is important. The function of the water is mentioned in vv. 10-13,16-17; it is certainly implied in the rest of the text⁽¹⁸⁾. In vv. 14-15, however, this motif gives way to the description of YHWH's acting, which in fact is the principal theme. Not only is it YHWH who makes the water come from the depths and from heaven⁽¹⁹⁾, but the sprouting of grass and herbage too, though depending on the rain and the

⁽¹²⁾ This interpretation is apparently also suggested by W. S. McCULLOUGH, hesitatingly: "*the fruit of thy work* may mean all of the Lord's manifold operations, not merely his sending of rain" (IB IV, 553). No arguments are given.

⁽¹³⁾ Generally, of course, the article is often omitted in poetry, and in the present case, too, the usage cannot be expected to be very strict. Sometimes it may be determined by tradition or by the demands of rhythm. See e.g. Ps 146,6a; 147,4,14,19.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Also Isa 40,22-23,26; 43,16-17; 44,26b-28; Amos 9,5-6; Job 5,10.

⁽¹⁵⁾ See also e.g. Job 5,12-13.

⁽¹⁶⁾ It is plausible that in v. 10 the subject of *y^hhallēkūn* is identical with the object of *ham^hšallēaḥ*, viz. *ma' yānīm*; cf. e.g. Ps 81,13; Gen 24,56; Exod 18,27. Consequently, *n^hālīm* should be taken as "gullies", not "torrents". As to the use of *b^h*, see BDB, s.v., I,4 (mentioning, among other texts, Lev 16,22).

⁽¹⁷⁾ Thus e.g. R. KITTEL (KAT XIII; ⁵⁶1929); A. WEISER (ATD XV; ⁶1963); A. A. ANDERSON (New Century Bible; 1972).

⁽¹⁸⁾ This also applies to v. 18. Because the mountains, the high mountains as well, are watered by YHWH (v. 13a), they can be a home for the wild goats and the badgers. Thus C. A. BRIGGS (ICC; 1907); H. J. KRAUS (BKAT XV/2; ⁵1978).

⁽¹⁹⁾ Vv. 10 and 13. Cf. Gen 49,25; Deut 33,13; Ezek 31,4,15.

dew⁽²⁰⁾, is essentially a work of God. The same is true of man's provision with bread, wine and oil, even if it requires human labour in addition⁽²¹⁾.

With regard to vv. 14c.15 an interpretation is followed which, it would seem, gradually presents itself as the most convincing. On account of their strict analogy, vv. 14c.15a and 15b.c must be parallel distichs; if so, the infinitive construction is alternated in both of them by a finite construction which has a similar function⁽²²⁾. It furthermore suits the ancient Israelite view that God, not man, is the subject of "bring forth" in v. 14c⁽²³⁾ and, consequently, of "make shine" in v. 15b. Finally, G. Leonardi is probably right in assuming that the clauses with finite verb also have YHWH as a subject⁽²⁴⁾.

If the lines in question are read in this way⁽²⁵⁾, the meaning of vv. 10-18 is very clear. As a result of YHWH's acting, the earth receives all it needs: the soil is drenched⁽²⁶⁾, animals may quench their thirst, the trees (dwelling-place of birds) are watered, the cattle have a grassy meadow, man has bread, wine and oil for celebrating life. V. 13b is a summary, a conclusion from what precedes⁽²⁷⁾, preparing further description: "the earth is satisfied with the fruit of thy works!"

Free University
De Boelelaan 1105
1081 HV Amsterdam

Th. BOOIJ

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. e.g. Deut 11,14; Isa 55,10.

⁽²¹⁾ V. 14b 'ābōdā, cf. v. 23. In the given context *l'* means "for", "in view of" (cf. Gen 22,7; 1 Sam 8,16; BDB, s.v., 5h); as for the idea, see Gen 2,5. Since 'ēšeb only refers to annuals (cereals, herbs, vegetables), human labour is indicated incompletely, which, however, fits in with the tenor of the passage.

⁽²²⁾ Thus already F. DELITZSCH ('1883); E. KÖNIG (1927); H. GUNKEL (HKAT II/2; '1926). See e.g. 1 Sam 2,8; Isa 10,2; 49,5; 64,1; Ps 105,22; Job 33,17; Prov 8,21; GKC § 114r; A. B. DAVIDSON, *Hebrew Syntax* (Edinburgh '1901) § 96. The view that *yayin* (v. 15a) is an object to *l'hôšî* (v. 14c) and is followed by a relative clause, can do no justice to the analogy.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. e.g. Ezek 36,29; Joel 2,19; Job 38,27. It is said that bread comes out of the earth (Job 28,5) and that the earth brings forth vegetation (Gen 1,12; Isa 61,11; Hag 1,11), but not that man makes things come forth from the earth. See also Deut 29,22; Isa 55,10 (*šmḥ hiph'il*).

⁽²⁴⁾ G. LEONARDI, *Bib* 49 (1968) 241. Likewise M. DAHOOD (AB; 1970); L. C. ALLEN (Word Bibl. Comm. XXI; 1983); P. AUFFRET, *Hymnes d'Égypte et d'Israël* (Fribourg, Suisse - Göttingen 1981) 177. *s'd* (v. 15c) is used in the same way as in Judg 19,5. *šmḥ pi'el* has a direct object and *b'* in Ps 92,5 and Hos 7,3; however, the factitive *pi'el* may have double object as well: see Isa 22,21 beside 41,7 (*hzaq*); Isa 43,23 beside 29,13 (*kbd*); Job 22,18 beside 40,31 (*ml'*); cf. Ps 32,7.10 (*sbb po'el*).

⁽²⁵⁾ Translating: "to bring forth bread from the earth, and gladden with wine the heart of man; to make the faces shine with oil, and sustain the heart of man with bread". Since "bringing forth bread" implies the phase of production following after that of the "sprouting" of herbage, v. 14c can best be taken in a final sense, and the same is true then of the following stichs.

⁽²⁶⁾ This notion is fundamental in vv. 13-16 and is certainly implied in v. 13b. Cf. Deut 11,11; Isa 55,10; Job 38,27; Prov 30,16.

⁽²⁷⁾ Cf. Ps 33,5, where the formal relation between the first and second stichs is the same as in Ps 104,13. See also Ps 103,5; 147,17.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

W. GESENIUS, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. Edited by R. Meyer and H. Donner. 18th edition, fasc 1, א-ג, Berlin, Springer Verlag, 1987. xxx-233 p. 28 × 20. DM 248,—.

At the 1971 Uppsala congress R. Meyer announced the preparation of the 18th edition of the Gesenius lexicon (VTS XII [1972] 174-184). Its first fascicle has now finally come out, 66 years after the last edition of G(esenius)-B(uhl). Almost seven decades of Hebrew-related studies have provided a challenging body of material for this new edition, especially the biblical manuscripts from the Judean desert, the ever-growing awareness of non-Tiberian traditions, and the Ugaritic material along with its interpretations. Meanwhile, two major Hebrew lexica, Koehler-Baumgartner (1953, 21958) and its still uncompleted third edition known as *HALAT* (1967, 1974, 1983...) have appeared. It is therefore to be expected that G(esenius)-M(eyer)-D(onner) will be an improvement on both GB and *HALAT*.

The general format is similar to that of GB and *HALAT*, namely, alphabetical arrangement, etymological and comparative material at the head of each entry, inventory of MT forms, evidence for non-Tiberian pronunciations, definitions of meanings with examples, variant readings taken from the critical apparatus of *BHK* and *BHS*, bibliography, and finally a list of derivations.

GMD lists all the forms that appear in the Hebrew Bible, thus providing more complete data for phonological and morphological observations than GB and *HALAT*. The indispensable companion to GMD is, naturally, R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik*, I-IV (Berlin 1966-1972), the most up-to-date if not the most complete Hebrew reference grammar.

There are more examples of words in their contexts than in GB or *HALAT*, thus giving a better picture of the various *uses* of a given word. This practice is most helpful in dealing with words, such as prepositions and particles, or expressions whose meaning are determined primarily by their contexts. For example, GMD is more complete in its treatment in words like אֲךָ, אֲכִי and אֲף. Nevertheless, it has not surpassed S. R. Driver's treatment of such words in *BDB*. A case in point is the preposition ב: GMD fails to treat

der *וּגָב*, p. 163). Unlike *HALAT*, GMD does not accept 'to avenge' for *יִגְמֹרָה* in Ps 7,10 on the basis of the Ugaritic *gmr*, although this Ugaritic word is noted at the head of the entry. Another example of such justified caution is the reluctance to take *אָמַר* in Ps 71,10 as 'to see' on the basis of Ugaritic and Akkadian, despite R. Meyer's acceptance of such meaning in VTS XXII (1972) 180f. The editors also rightly consider the time not yet ripe for using the Ebla material.

And now some marginalia:

- אָבַד* (p. 3 right-hand col.): If, on the basis of Arabic '*abada*', one takes Prov 11,7b *אָבְדָה* [אֲבָדָה] [אֲבָדָה] as '(the hope of the faithful) is lasting', then one may have a case of "Gegensinn" or polar meanings: 'to perish' — 'to be lasting'. Consequently, this meaning should have been included under *אָבַד* rather than under a homophonous *hapax*. Compare *יָרַד* 'to go down', which in a number of instances means 'to go up': Judg 11,37; 15,8; 2 Sam 5,17; 2 Kgs 2,2; 6,18.
- אָדַר* (p. 17 right): In Exod 15,6, rather than a participle niphāl *ne'dārī*, the form (מִימֵינָהּ יָדָהּ) נָאֲדָרִי can be read as infinitive absolute niphāl *ne'dōrī* 'to be majestic', the *yod compaginis* being a remnant of the Canaanite **qatālī*. This avoids the problem of a construct chain broken by a preposition. The same can be said of Gen 49,11 *אָסִיר*, to be revocalized as infinitive absolute '*āsōrī*. See W. L. Moran, "The Hebrew Language in Its Northwest Semitic Background" (FS. Albright 1961) 60, already mentioned in R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik* II, § 45,3e.
- אֱלֹהִים* (p. 62 left, under C3): Jonah 3,3 עִיר גְּדוֹלָה לֵאלֹהִים 'bei Gott eine grosse Stadt' hardly reproduces the superlative sense of *לֵאלֹהִים* '(an) enormously great (city)' Ps 68,16 הָרַם ה' אֱלֹהִים must mean 'a majestic mountain' (*New Jewish Version*) rather than just 'Gottesberg'.
- אָתִי* (p. 115 right): It would be useful to mention Cant 4,8 אָתִי, revocalized as '*ēti* 'come!' instead of MT '*itti* 'with me', listed only under *אָתָּא* (p. 115 bottom left).
- בָּבִי* (p. 122 right): For this name, compare the epithet of the Phoenician deity *Šid b'by*, *babi* in Greek transliteration, discussed in R. du Mesnil du Buisson, *Nouvelles études sur les dieux et les mythes de Canaan* (Leiden 1973) 228-233.
- בֹּא* (p. 128): One should perhaps add the auxiliary use of the verb to indicate the inchoative sense of the principal verb as in Gen 13,18 וַיָּבֹא וַיֵּשֶׁב and Gen 23,2 וַיָּבֹא אַבְרָהָם לְסֹפֶר לְשׁוּרָה (already observed by Rashbam and Ramban). This use is analogous to the frequent construction וַיָּקָם followed by a principal verb. Further, the idiomatic expression בֹּא אֵל 'to have sexual intercourse with' as in Gen 6,4; 16,2; Ps 51,2 should have been mentioned here rather than under the preposition אֵל (p. 58, left) to distinguish it from its normal sense 'to come into' e.g. Gen 6,18; 7,1.
- בוֹשָׁה* (p. 133 right): The Arabic *bahita/bahuta* 'erstaunt, verwirrt sein' must have been formed after the Aramaic-Syriac *bhet* (with *-h-* as an inner Aramaic development). If so, then it is of little use and could be left out.

- בחור (p. 136 left): The first meaning given, 'young man', is to be compared with the Ugaritic *baḥḥuru* or *baḥḥuru* = Akkadian *eḥlu* (*Ugaritica* V, 137.ii 24'), whereas the second meaning, 'troop', comes from *בחור* 'to select'.
- בטח₂ (p. 139 left): This is an unnecessary *hapax*; the hiphil participle Ps 22,10 (על שרי אמי) מבטיחי 'who makes me feel secure at my mother's breast' is a derivation of בטח 'to be secure/to feel at home'.
- ברה₂ (p. 173 right): Read the Akkadian cognate as *barû* I instead of *barû* II. This homophonous root may, however, just be another unnecessary *hapax*. If 1 Sam 17,8 ברו is a Qal imperative of a root that means 'sich ausersehen, auswählen', then why can it not be taken as Qal imperative of ברר 'to select' (p. 181 right under 1)?
- בשן (p. 184 right): One can consider the Ugaritic *bṯn* 'serpent', 'dragon' for MT *bāšān* in Ps 68,23. *NEB* reads: "The Lord says, 'I will return from the Dragon, I will return from the depths of the sea'". The usual Hebrew equivalent for Ugaritic *bṯn*, פתן 'viper' is an Aramaic form; compare Aramaic פתנא.
- גבול (p. 192 right): The fourth meaning, 'mountain', is rightly labelled as uncertain despite the Arabic *ḡabal* and the Ugaritic *gbl*. In fact the main evidence for 'mountain' comes from the LXX rendering of גבול in Ps 78,54 and 103,33 as *oros* 'mountain'. But *oros* is more likely to be a corruption of *horos* 'frontier', which is the usual meaning of גבול (see Rahlfs' note on Ps 77 [= 78],58, and 1 Sam 10,2). This will also explain LXX Ps 103,32 (MT 33).
- גלש (p. 220): One may consider Ugar. *gl* 'to stream down' in connexion with Cant 4,1 (שערך כעדר העזים ש)גלשו (מהר גלעד) 'your hair [is] like a flock of goats streaming down from Mt. Gilead' (*NEB*).

Biblical scholars and Hebraists will, for a long time to come, be indebted to the editors for this masterly work. We hope that the pages containing the Hebrew word תשעים 'ninety' and the Aramaic name תתני 'Tattenai' will see the light of day before the end of the century!

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

Agustinus GIANTO

Luis ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics* (Subsidia Biblica 11). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1988. x-228 p. 24 × 16,5. Lit 24.500.

Yet another work on Hebrew poetry may not exactly be needed, it might seem, since there are now quite a few available. In view of its broad canvas and uncluttered approach, though, the work under review can

be described as an excellent introduction to this topic. Professor Alonso Schökel's intention is "to initiate the reader into the stylistic analysis of poetry" (p. vi), not to provide a work of reference. His general focus is on the reading and understanding of poems and not on classification and dry dissection (but see below). He is particularly strong when presenting imagery and the stylistics of sound, antithesis and synonymy. Instead of simply enunciating principles he teaches by means of numerous examples, inviting the reader to imitate his method.

The Manual is a shorter, updated English version of the author's *Estudios de poética hebrea* which was published in 1963 (Barcelona). The abridgement has been achieved largely by the excision of the summaries of previous work (*Estudios*, pp. 3-54) and of the very lengthy section on passages from Isaiah (pp. 356-534). The formidable tome of 1963 has been replaced by a slimmer and altogether more inviting work-book.

After an extremely brief chapter on previous studies on Hebrew poetry comes a chapter on poetic genres. Here he lists Hebrew terms for different literary forms and like G. Rinaldi concludes that such terms are too vague to be significant. It should be noted that *massa'*, translated "threatening oracle" (p. 9) may simply refer to "raising one's voice" — *nasa'* with ellipsis of the expected *qol* (see K. J. Cathcart, *Nahum in the Light of Northwest Semitic* [Rome 1973] 36-37).

The chapter on sound in poetry is illuminating. Sound is too often ignored in the study of Hebrew poetry, especially as we modern readers are more likely to peruse the text silently than to declaim it aloud, as the author reminds us. Sound repetition, alliteration, paronomasia and so on are all succinctly described, with examples. Inexplicably the term "synaesthesia" is avoided even though the phenomenon is described (p. 90). Perhaps a reference to A. Berlin, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism* (Bloomington 1985), particularly to the section on phonological aspects (chapter V), might not have been amiss at this juncture. It is also my opinion that too much has been crammed into the next chapter which is on rhythm where the author defends the accentual nature of Hebrew verse.

The next two chapters are concerned with parallelism and with synonymy, repetition and merismus respectively. Synonymy is not just a variety of parallelism, the author points out, but "an autonomous stylistic technique used on many occasions and with different aims" (p. 64). True, it has not been studied extensively (p. 73) but recent work on "tours", a series of synonyms used in consecutive parallel lines, could have been mentioned (though there is brief reference on p. 62 to groups of three or four word pairs).

Chapter VII is headed "Antithesis and Polarised Expression". Since antithesis (and not simply antithetic parallelism) occurs so often in Hebrew poetry the author rightly wonders why it has not been the subject of more intensive study (p. 90). In fact, he has overlooked two recent publications which go some way towards making up this lack. They are J. A. Loader, *Polar Structures in the Book of Qoheleth* (BZAW 152; Berlin 1979) and J. Krašovec, *Antithetic Structure in Biblical Hebrew Poetry* (VTS 35; Leiden 1984). In fairness it should be remembered that Alonso Schökel was one

of the few to write on this topic (*Estudios*, pp. 251-268), a comment which applies to the next chapter as well, which is on imagery. Although these are probably the best pages in the book, I think they would have been even better if ancient Near Eastern imagery had been brought in for comparative purposes. Hebrew verse did not develop in total isolation from neighbouring cultures. For example, the paragraphs on animal imagery (p. 127; see also pp. 158-159) would have benefited from consultation of, say, P. D. Miller, jr., "Animal Names as Designations in Ugaritic and Hebrew", *UF* 2 (1970) 177-186. For a different understanding of Prov 30,18-19 (cited on p. 98) see now G. Del Olmo Lete, "Nota sobre Prov 30,19 (*wǝderek geber b'e'almāh*)", *Bib* 57 (1986) 68-74.

"Figures of Speech" is the next chapter, covering a whole range of related topics: citation, allusion and reminiscence; questions, exclamations, apostrophe and aphorism; irony, sarcasm and humour; ellipsis and hyperbole. While he defines "apostrophe" as "suddenly directing the speech at someone, thereby interrupting the course of the exposition" (p. 154) it is also currently understood to be "a figure of speech which consists in addressing a dead or absent person, an animal, a thing, or an abstract quality or idea as if it were alive, present, and capable of understanding" (*Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* [Princeton 1975]).

In chapter X there is a brief exploration of dialogue and monologue, including discussion of interior dialogue. Additional work on this subject is evidently required. See, for example, B. R. Foster, "Self-Reference of an Akkadian Poet", *JAOS* 103 (1983) 123-130. Also, Alonso Schökel's remark "stylistically speaking, monologue is not one person speaking but the breaking into a context of dialogue with a reflection directed at oneself" (p. 178) should have taken into account the book of Job, largely a series of lengthy diatribes which though delivered by different people and ostensibly "replies", can almost be classed as monologues since there is so very little interaction between the speakers. The closing chapter deals with development and composition. As the author explains, development is the expansion of a theme into a lengthy work; composition is the conversion of disparate elements into a unified whole. Once again there is ample food for thought here. The delicate problem of distinguishing between original compositions, later additions and final forms is touched on (p. 190) with no dogmatism of any kind. This is refreshingly helpful. It can be noted, in passing, that additional examples of hysteron-proteron (mentioned p. 186) are Exod 15,11; Ezek 1,10 and Zach 8,12. An appendix lists books by the author on biblical themes; this is followed by an index of biblical passages, an author index and a subject index.

On several occasions the author comments on the dangers of over-classification (pp. 3, 57, 60, 90, 92, 121 and 166) and in spite of my own tendency in this direction (noted on p. 57) I would agree that it is easy to classify unnecessarily. It is not labelling that matters so much as determining the function of a particular form of parallelism, chiasmus, repetition and so on, within a poem. It must be admitted that even Alonso Schökel himself is not completely averse to making subdivisions (see pp. 76ff., on repetition; 114, on techniques in imagery; 150, on rhetorical

and wisdom questions; 170f., on dialogue and monologue). It boils down to a matter of judgment and balance, of course; perhaps the correct approach lies somewhere between our respective tendencies. As the author states: "Less classification is needed and more analysis of style, although I admit that in a manual such as this a certain amount of distinction and classification is necessary. A certain amount, but not too much!" (p. 57).

Also hammered home is the contention that explicit lines in proverbs and elsewhere are very often secondary in character. The original saying was concise and the added part explanatory and academic (see pp. 87 and 114f. and the comment: "Many proverbs have been ruined by being developed with synonymous or antithetical parallelism, or with an explanation", p. 187). This viewpoint is not novel but it remains valid and lends itself to further discussion (material for a seminar perhaps?); it also has implications for determining the development of Hebrew poetry.

In spite of the general easy flow of the book the reader has to work quite hard at times. For instance, the "Law of Mussafia" is mentioned (pp. 42 and 44) but absolutely no explanation is provided. Almost as tantalizing is the truncated discussion of the "rhythmic cell" in connection with Isa 7,15.16 and Jer 13,6.8.9 (pp. 42-44). The reader is left to look elsewhere for elucidation. Again, in some examples the text is merely set out (in translation) with practically no comment (e.g. pp. 132-133 — extracts from Job 37) and even where comment is given no emphasis is provided. In many cases some degree of highlighting (bold, italics, etc.) would have been helpful. Occasionally, explanations are not developed (e.g. p. 114 on Ps 23). In fact, there is plenty of material for the student to work on, particularly if in addition the suggestions for further study (pp. 89, 107, 113f., 127, 132, 140, 152, 161, 165, 176f., 187) are taken up.

The following misprints can be listed: "directed" for "edited" (p. 3); "area" for "areas" (p. 4); "polivalence" for "polyvalence" and "show" for "shows" (p. 29); "fellow" for "follow" (p. 59); "Fisch" for "Fish" (p. 133); "Psychoanalitische" for "Psychoanalytische" (p. 140); "nor" for "or" (p. 187, Jer 22,17) and in the index (p. 216) shift "12,1-5 177" from after "20,14-18" to after "12,1-3". Note, too, that the sub-heading "Assonance" (p. 25) should be in italics. One last negative point: there are few cross-references within the book; e.g., the mention of dialogue and monologue on p. 150 should have provoked a reference to the broader discussion, pp. 170ff. Of course, these are mere quibbles.

Throughout his book and even in the blurb on the back cover Professor Alonso Schökel is generous enough to make repeated and positive reference to my own volume on Hebrew poetry. I am pleased of course, not least because it is an indication that our respective works complement each other. *Classical Hebrew Poetry* provides detailed classification of techniques as well as a modicum of comparative material from ancient Near Eastern literature. *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics* (where the verse of ancient Syria and Mesopotamia is not considered at all) is a gentler, less arid introduction with expansive discussion of topics I only touched on or did

not even mention. This is the book to put into the hands of students expressing some interest in ancient Hebrew poetry; it will encourage and assist them to consult the growing number of specialist books on a fascinating subject.

Dep. de Hebreo y Arameo
Facultad de Filología
Universidad de Barcelona
08007 Barcelona

Wilfred G. E. WATSON

Jean CHRYSOSTOME. *Commentaire sur Job*. Tome I (Chapitres I-XIV). Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Henri SORLIN avec la collaboration de Louis Neyrand, s.j. (Sources chrétiennes 346). Paris, Le Cerf, 1988. 366 p. 12,4 × 19,5. 232 F.

Voilà un commentaire inédit du Livre de Job, attribué, sans doute avec raison (cf. p. 69-70), à S. Jean Chrysostome. H. Sorlin en avait présenté le projet dès le quatrième congrès de patristique d'Oxford il y a vingt-cinq ans et lui avait consacré une thèse de troisième cycle, soutenue en 1975 devant l'Université de Lyon-II. Le P. Louis Neyrand, des Sources chrétiennes, en a aidé la publication. Cette collaboration lui a-t-elle rappelé la conférence que son oncle, le P. Joseph Neyrand, professeur à l'Institut biblique, y avait donnée le 26 mars 1922 et qui parut dans les *Études* la même année (t. 173, p. 129-151) sous le titre «Le livre de Job et les poèmes d'Homère»?

Le t. I comprend les quatorze premiers chapitres. La première partie de l'introduction étudie le texte, dont l'établissement repose sur une double tradition: 1) la tradition directe, représentée par les deux manuscrits de base M(osquensis, Bibl. synod. 114, Vladimir 55), de X^e siècle; L(aurentianus Med. IX, 13), des X^e-XI^e siècles; 2) la tradition indirecte, celle des chaînes exégétiques, dont le meilleur témoins est p (Vatic. gr. Pii II 1), du XI^e siècle. Cinq autres manuscrits de chaînes, dont le plus ancien est un oncial, b (Patriacus 171), du VIII^e siècle, forment souvent un second étage de l'apparat. Le texte édité est celui de LM, confirmé en bien des cas par p; mais il faut d'ordinaire écarter les suppléments de p, qui multiplie les particules de liaison pour mieux structurer les phrases: dans la seule p. 82 de l'édition, l'apparat indique quatre additions pour le § 4 du prologue: 5 ταπεινωθέντα: + ἀλλὰ p; 8 πόθεν: + οὖν p; 11 ἔμαθε: γὰρ ἔμαθεν p; 12 ποθεν: + οὖν p. A s'en tenir à LM, sans les liaisons supplémentaires de p, reste un «texte rude, donnant parfois l'impression d'un certain décousu et comportant même, de temps en temps, un manque de suite dans les idées»; ce décousu «peut tenir au caractère même du commentaire, qui est une explication 'ad verbum', destinée à un auditoire populaire» (p. 68). Quant au texte scripturaire de LM, il répond à celui «qu'avait l'habitude de lire et de commenter Chrysostome» (p. 41), et la proportion des citations scripturaires est celle des œuvres incon-

testées (p. 43-44). Les procédés de style, oratoires ou analytiques, rappellent également ceux de ces œuvres (p. 67).

L'exégèse de Chrysostome exploite ici ses thèmes habituels (p. 53 et n. 2), en particulier l'affrontement des deux grands adversaires: le diable (p. 55-58), l'athlète de Dieu (p. 58-65). La description de la femme de Job est d'une fine psychologie; son incroyable liberté de langage, la *parrhèsia* si chère aux Grecs (le mot se trouve p. 176, l. 43), montre que "Job l'avait bien formée" (p. 176, l. 44); les plaintes de II 11, sur sa propre misère, — si injustes à l'égard de son mari, — sont d'un beau mouvement; et la traduction, d'ordinaire excellente, s'est ici surpassée.

Les notes explicatives justifient à l'occasion une conjecture (p. 252, n. 1: ἀνέμιξαν pour l'ἀνέμιξαν de LMP) ou des transpositions de phrases entières (p. 179, n. 1; 262, n. 1; 335, n. 2; 346, n. 1; 349, n. 1...). Elles concernent parfois la syntaxe; mais celle de Chrysostome s'écarte peu de l'usage classique. Plusieurs empruntent des textes parallèles à d'autres œuvres incontestées. P. 258, l. 10, écrire: Ὁ δὲ λέγει (cf. la traduction). Plusieurs rapprochent des textes parallèles empruntés à d'autres œuvres incontestées. On attendra avec intérêt la suite de l'édition.

Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Edouard DES PLACES, S.J.

Reinhard BODENMANN, *Naissance d'une Exégèse. Daniel dans l'Eglise ancienne des trois premiers siècles* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese 28). Tübingen, J. B. C. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1986. xviii-442 p. DM 98,—.

This exacting volume represents a thesis prepared under the direction of Pierre Prigent and presented to the Faculté de Théologie Protestante de Strasbourg (1984). Bodenmann traces the interpretation of those portions of the book of Daniel generally regarded as apocalyptic in modern research and recognized as "prophetic" by the early Church. Four principal themes from Daniel dominate this study: the theory of successive world empires (2,38-45; chs. 7-8); the figure of the Son of Man (7,9-14); the prophecy of the seventy weeks (9,24-27); the eschatological conflict (chs. 11-12). The author demarcates his project clearly, yet a more precise title might have been desired, since this volume traces neither the development of the figure of Daniel nor the overall reception of the biblical book during the first centuries.

Bodenmann sets himself a number of diverse and demanding tasks in the present study. The opening chapter offers a painstaking assessment of the Greek text of Daniel known to early Christian exegetes. The second chapter examines the paucity of early exegesis concerning the "seventy weeks", while the third chapter takes up varied aspects of the interpretation of Daniel during the first three quarters of the second century. The final chapter examines

the sudden blossoming of patristic interest in the prophecies of Daniel — in the works of Irenaeus, Clement, Tertullian, Hippolytus — at the end of the second and the beginning of the third centuries. The organization of the study, at times difficult for the reader, seems to have been determined largely by the author's goal (p. 6) "de découvrir les mécanismes qui régissent l'héréneutique chrétienne de ce livre et d'en comprendre les particularités".

The volume opens with a fresh investigation of an area of notorious difficulty: the text of Daniel as reflected by second- and third-century Christian authors. This is the first thorough study of the question since Ziegler's researches in connection with his exemplary edition (Göttingen 1954) of the Greek texts of the book of Daniel. The problem revolves around the existence of two competing Greek translations: the Old Greek (or, less accurately, Septuagint) and the later revision associated with the name of Theodotion. The ultimate supremacy of Theodotion Daniel in the early Church has never received adequate explanation — already Jerome admits his ignorance in this regard — and Bodenmann is not content with the scholarly consensus which judges Origen's text-critical efforts to have been decisive. This conundrum touches directly upon any attempt to determine the precise nature of the Daniel text current prior to the displacement (and virtual disappearance) of the Old Greek.

Bodenmann demonstrates, through a close examination of selected passages, that a range of early Christian authors, commonly regarded as representatives of the Old Greek text, in fact employed a "mixed" text bearing characteristics both of that version and of Theodotion. This widely diffused text, according to the author, was certainly Jewish in origin and closely related to, if not identical with, the "proto-Theodotion" of recent discussion. (Bodenmann appears to be unaware of a similar suggestion ventured in connection with Justin's citation of Dan 7,9-28 [*Dial.* 31] by D. Barthélemy following the discovery of the Dodekapropheton scroll at Nahal Hever: *RB* 60 [1953] 26.) This hypothesis assumes a far more thoroughgoing curtailment of the influence of the Old Greek text early in the second century and thus a more gradual (and comprehensible) predominance of the Theodotionic version. Bodenmann's theory is, in many respects, both convincing and attractive, though I would like to have seen some attempt made to assess the Greek text(s) employed by Hippolytus of Rome (see the author's disclaimers on pp. 69-70 and 105). My own examination of Hippolytus' *Commentary* on the book of Daniel does not support the theory of a "mixed" text (*pace* Ziegler) and would seem to indicate the continued vitality of both Greek versions of the biblical work at the turn of the third century.

The importance of the Greek versions of Daniel, however, goes far beyond their existence as a textual basis for early Christian interpretation. They stand, above all else, as our earliest witnesses to the exegesis of the biblical book. Bodenmann is clearly aware of this significance — as evidenced by his ample discussion of the Old Greek of Dan 9,24-27 (pp. 109-121, 377-390) — yet fails to give it wider expression. An example of such an unexploited opportunity is the remarkable order of presentation preserved in papyrus 967 of the Old Greek: chs. 1-4; 7-8; 5-6; 9-12! Some of the consequences of this alternative "reading" of the book of Daniel have recent-

ly been developed by P.-M. Bogaert, "Relecture et refonte historicisantes du livre de Daniel attestées par la première version grecque (Papyrus 967)", *Études sur le judaïsme hellénistique* (P. Kuntzmann and J. Schlosser, eds.) (Paris 1984) 197-224. Bodenmann's overall concern with the interaction of history and eschatology in Daniel could not fail to have been enhanced by the discussion of an early textual version which breaks down the traditional division between legend (chs. 1-6) and apocalyptic vision (7-12) in order to preserve a coherent chronological, i.e. historical, framework.

Much attention is quite naturally given to the christological interpretation of the vision in Dan 7,9-14. Bodenmann is mercifully brief on the "son of man" problem within its New Testament matrix and proceeds, rather, to discuss a wide range of second- and third-century sources. His presentation is carefully nuanced and succeeds particularly in emphasizing the variety of exegetical views. Here, as elsewhere in the study, Bodenmann is sensitive to the tension between "historicising" and eschatological interpretations and recurrently observes how the latter understanding comes to fruition in the writings of Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Hippolytus. Bodenmann is clearly fascinated in this regard (pp. 314-315, 371-375) by Origen's bold attempt to mitigate the eschatological tenor of the biblical narrative through his exegesis of Dan 7,13 in conjunction with Matt 24,30 (*Comm Matt C Ser* 50 [GCS 38] 109ff.).

It is precisely because Bodenmann's discussion is so interesting at this juncture that one regrets his failure to take account of current scholarship on the question. His presentation would have been enhanced through critical engagement with the studies of Maurice Casey (*Son of Man. The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* [London 1979]) and Alan Segal (*Two Powers in Heaven* [Leiden 1977]), to cite only two examples. While neither Casey nor Segal examine the early Christian evidence in so thorough a manner as Bodenmann, they both attempt a far broader assessment of the relationship between the early Church and Jewish exegetical tradition. Indeed, the treatment of Jewish sources must stand as the principal weakness of the present study. Though an integral aspect of Bodenmann's declared intent (p. 5), the Jewish background receives neither the clarity nor the prominence it demands. Rabbinic references are widely scattered in the volume's notes, but passages are only rarely cited in full and never carefully analyzed. Here, too, bibliographical resources exist which Bodenmann unfortunately does not exploit: one thinks immediately of the classic multi-volume work by Louis Ginzberg (*Legends of the Jews* [Philadelphia 1909-1938]) as well as the traditions gathered in Jay Braverman's study of Jerome's *Commentary on Daniel* (CBQMS 7; Washington, DC 1978).

The final chapter of the book offers a detailed examination of the close interplay between historical understanding and eschatological expectation in Christian exegesis of the second and third centuries. Particular emphasis is devoted to the wide range of approaches to the "seventy weeks" of Dan 9,24 and the identification of the "eschatological enemy" of Daniel 11. Bodenmann is, once again, a sure guide to the intricacies of the chronological schema spawned by Clement, Tertullian, Hippolytus, and others. His discussion of these authors and their systems would have been enriched, however, by taking account of broader political perspectives. Seminal in this regard, and

unmentioned by Bodenmann, are K. J. Neumann's analysis of *Hippolytus von Rom in seiner Stellung zu Staat und Welt* (Leipzig 1902) and A. A. T. Ehrhardt's *Politische Metaphysik von Solon bis Augustin* (Tübingen 1959-69).

We are left with the difficult, yet central, question which Bodenmann poses at the beginning of his study: what are the "mechanisms" at work in the development of the Christian understanding(s) of the book of Daniel during the first two centuries? There is a certain level on which the development of biblical exegesis can (and must) be examined as the result of a powerful inner dynamic — a coherent tradition of interpretation marked by both continuity and change. It is the elaboration of the question on this level which stands as Bodenmann's principal achievement. Yet there are closely related questions whose answers must be sought in the social, political, and theological background of each author and his interpretation. Bodenmann's acute discussions, often weak on historical context, do not readily address this level of concern.

The technical production of the volume demands brief comment. The typewritten text, while admirably free of errors and handwritten corrections, is far from visually pleasing, and the choice of an italic face for the body of the work was surely ill-advised. There has been an attempt, with limited success, to introduce typeset headings for chapter titles and sub-titles. (Only an attentive reader, for example, will be certain that the extended Latin quotation on pp. 58-62 is drawn from the writings of Victorinus of Pettau.) This is a minor complaint, perhaps, but more the shame if such features should needlessly detract from Bodenmann's learned and intelligent exposition of a crucial episode in the history of biblical exegesis.

Hebrew University
91905 Jerusalem
Israel

David SATRAN

Novum Testamentum

Richard J. CASSIDY, *Society and Politics in the Acts of the Apostles*. Maryknoll, N.Y., Orbis Books, 1987. XII-239 p.

This book functions as a sequel to Cassidy's earlier book, *Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel* (Maryknoll, N.Y. 1978). The primary objectives of the present book are to analyze Luke's social and political descriptions of the disciples in the Book of Acts and to put forward some reflections about Luke's purpose in writing his two-volume work. Cassidy believes that Luke wrote for reasons of neither political nor ecclesial apologetic, but with a threefold purpose: to express and share his own personal commitment to Jesus, to provide his fellow Christians with guidance for their exercise of discipleship within the context of Roman rule and, more specifi-

cally, with a correct attitude toward "trial witness" before various political officials.

Cassidy has written an interesting book, and his years of dedication to the question of social and political concerns in Luke-Acts have surely been fruitful. He definitely challenges us to draw out of Luke's text all that we can. There are new insights to be gained. However, I do have some reservations about Cassidy's understanding of Luke.

My main concern centers on Cassidy's methodology. He contends that he is reporting what Luke thinks. In other words, Cassidy is doing redaction criticism. But in point of fact, now and again Cassidy is using historical criticism or social analysis. For instance, on pp. 142-143 (see also pp. 120-125) Cassidy maintains that Luke portrays Paul as a disturber of Roman rule in a much more pronounced way than he does Jesus or the apostles. Due to his extensive travels and activities, Paul was much more of an *actual* danger to Roman rule than were they. In general, I can accept this statement, but I cannot agree that it is Luke's opinion. On the contrary, Cassidy has gathered from the text data which provides his reader with an idea of the political and social situations both Jesus and his disciples faced, but not with what Luke was primarily intending. If I am correct, this would mean that the conclusions of Cassidy's whole study are compromised since at times he is using redaction criticism, while at other times we are seeing what historical, political or social data can be gleaned from Luke-Acts.

Cassidy has over-emphasized the importance of the absence of *ptōchos*, "poor", from the text of Acts, and thus misinterprets its early chapters. The fact that the Christians, who in the first chapters of Acts benefited from the sharing of goods, are called "needy" (4,34) and not "poor" does not mean that they do not qualify as poor. Two other examples merit attention. The lame man was carried each morning to the Beautiful Gate to ask alms, and Peter (and John) tells him that they have no silver or gold but that they will give him what they have (3,2,6). Likewise, the charge of neglecting the Hellenistic widows in the daily distribution (6,1) appears to be an example of the community's effort to deal with poorer members.

Luke does not condemn rich people *per se*, but only in terms of their misuse of money. Also, Cassidy (p. 6) is incorrect when he asserts that Jesus does not take the initiative to seek hospitality from Zacchaeus until the latter says that he will give half of his goods to the poor and restore fourfold to anyone he has defrauded. Actually, as soon as Jesus sees Zacchaeus in the sycamore tree, he says, "Zacchaeus, make haste and come down; for I must stay at your house today" (Luke 19,5).

On another point, I am a little uncomfortable with Cassidy's (pp. 45-46, 133-135) translation of *parrēsia* as "boldness" since, at least, in American English "boldness" can have a pejorative nuance. "Confidence" or "intrepidity" might be better translations.

According to Cassidy (pp. 47-48), the fact that Luke notes that Agrippa I killed James "with the sword" may be intended to indicate that Herod moved against James on distinctly political grounds. But at that time how distinct were political grounds from religious ones? On the other hand, the text reads that Herod laid violent hands on some who belonged to the

church, that his execution of James pleased the Jews and that he therefore arrested Peter whom he intended to bring out to the people after the Passover (cf. Acts 12,1-5). No obviously political ground is given for Agrippa's action. Nor is clarity achieved by Cassidy's appeal to Luke 9,9 and to the fact that Herod Antipas indicates that he beheaded John the Baptist because of John's reproof of him for taking his brother's wife and for "all the evil that Herod had done" (Luke 3,19), since these accusations seem to be more religious than political in nature.

Cassidy has not fully understood Luke's presentation of the interactions between Christians and the Romans. First of all, Luke does not view the Herodian princes as Roman officials; thus, he can almost always portray them in a negative light (but see Acts 25,13-26,32).

Acts 18,12-17 is misconstrued by Cassidy to mean that Paul benefited from a combination of Gallio's anti-Semitism and his lack of regard for established Roman procedure. Even if such an interpretation were correct historically, it is certainly not what Luke wants to say in the passage. As elsewhere (e.g. Acts 23,6-10,29; 25,18-20,25-26; 26,2-8), Luke wants to stress that the Romans were not interested in judging questions about Jewish words, names or law; none of these concerned them (vv. 14-15).

Although it is true that neither Felix nor even Festus are portrayed as ideal Roman officials, Luke wants his reader to concentrate on the "reality" that, thanks to Roman officials and laws, Paul is not handed over to the Jewish authorities for trial. In this sense, Christianity is protected by Roman officials.

There are a number of other questionable statements about Luke's treatment of Paul. According to Cassidy (pp. 100-103), the Acts narrative does not portray Paul as attaching particular importance to his Roman citizenship. Paul never publicizes his citizenship before any of the non-Roman groups or individuals whom he addresses, and even before Roman officials it is not something to which Paul immediately adverts. However, probably for Luke Paul's reticence about his citizenship suggests humility, and certainly Paul's citizenship is a dominant factor in the final chapters of Acts. It explains Lysias' considerate treatment of him, the journey to Caesarea and Felix, the appeal before Festus and the voyage to Rome (cf. Acts 22,25-29; 23,27; 25,11-12,25-27; 26,32; 28,19). For Luke, Paul's citizenship is a significant part of his theme of Christians fitting well into the Roman world.

Cassidy (pp. 131-135) also misrepresents how Luke envisions Paul's being in chains. For Luke, the fact that Paul is in chains never interferes with his hero's ability to present his case or carry on his mission. Cassidy's failure to perceive this leads him to conclude that the last word of Acts, "unhindered", describes the resoluteness with which Paul continued his preaching and teaching and as indicating that his status as a prisoner and his chains did not have the effect of intimidating or deterring him from this witness. But Luke in the last verses of Acts (26,30-31) makes no mention of chains nor even an explicit reference to imprisonment and sees Paul as representative of all Christians (cf. Acts 26,29) enjoying minimal confinement. "Unhindered" describes how Christians and their message should fit into the then Roman world.

In his analysis of Acts 25,13-26,32, Cassidy (pp. 109-116) concludes that Luke presents Paul making a speech that is, to all intents and purposes, primarily oriented to the conversion of King Agrippa II. Elsewhere (*Acts 26. The Christological Climax of Paul's Defense* (Ac 22,1-26,32) [Rome 1978] 86-122, 156-160), I have demonstrated that Luke in this speech has actually reduced all of the charges against Paul to a belief in a resurrection and in what Moses and the prophets said, namely, that the Christ must suffer, be first to rise from the dead and proclaim light both to the people and the Gentiles (Acts 26,6-8.22-23). This is what Agrippa II (or more precisely Luke's reader) is to believe since neither Agrippa II nor Festus are the real audience of the speech. Luke in this speech dialogues with Jewish readers or at least individuals whose faith is very strongly influenced by the Hebrew Scriptures. This latter point will be relevant as we discuss Cassidy's interpretation of Luke's purpose in writing Luke-Acts.

According to Cassidy, Luke had a threefold purpose in writing Luke-Acts; if separate terms were utilized to provide for each of these assertions, Cassidy's designation of his theory might be "allegiance-conduct-witness". First of all, let us briefly view the "allegiance" aspect of this theory, namely, Luke wrote to express and share his own personal commitment to Jesus. Certainly, something of the author himself does come through to us in the pages of Luke-Acts; but Luke primarily wants to assure his reader of the truth concerning the things about which he or she has been instructed (Luke 1,1-4). Luke's interest is in the community where the God of Israel continues to work his salvation and in assuring his reader how God has and is doing this. Only indirectly is Luke-Acts a personal testimony of its author.

Cassidy's second and third aspects of Luke's threefold purpose in writing Luke-Acts, the "conduct-witness", are: to provide his fellow Christians with guidance for their exercise of discipleship within the context of Roman rule and, more specifically, with a correct understanding of "trial witness" before various political officials. However, both of these points put too much emphasis on Luke's treatment of the interaction between Christians and Roman officials. Much of this material is to be found only in the latter part of Acts, and so one naturally asks if Luke's purpose should be judged in terms of only a portion of the whole of Luke-Acts. Also in view of Cassidy's above misconception of the interaction between Christians and Roman officials and of his own description of "conduct", there appears to be considerable validity to the "theory of ecclesial apologetic" (pp. 156-157): Luke's concern to explain the empire in favorable terms to his fellow Christians and to encourage them to adopt a positive stance toward the Roman authorities. As regards "witness", does Luke really report much Christian witness before political officials, and in so far as he does, is his main message to his reader how they should do this?

The major difficulty with Cassidy's theory of Luke's threefold purpose (pp. 158-170) is that it does not sufficiently recognize the many other themes that Luke has. For instance, there are God's salvific will or, as some authorities prefer, promise-fulfilment, and the statement of Luke 1,1-4. Moreover, since Luke holds that the risen Christ is active, is not his Christology such

that it permeates the whole of Luke-Acts? On the other hand, why does Luke spend so much time explaining that the Christians are the true heirs of the Jewish tradition and that this message was proclaimed to the Jews, but that they refused it?

Cassidy tends to rely on a limited number of secondary authorities, and a brief concluding chapter would have enhanced his book. Yet he has written a good book. Cassidy raises some interesting questions and challenges us to attend to Luke's text and to draw out of it all that we can.

St. Louis University
3634 Lindell Blvd.
St. Louis, MO 63108
U.S.A.

Robert F. O'TOOLE, S.J.

F. Stanley JONES, "*Freiheit*" in den Briefen des Apostels Paulus. Eine historische, exegetische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie (Göttinger Theologische Arbeiten 34). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987. 301 p. 24,2 x 16,5. DM 62,—.

This volume began life as a dissertation under Professor Georg Strecker of Göttingen. It is a model of its kind — with a well-defined and limited topic, a line of inquiry clearly enunciated, a thesis carefully developed and well-argued, and displaying a good command of primary and secondary literature. The author takes his starting-point from the analysis of Johannes Weiss and Rudolf Bultmann which promoted the threefold schema: freedom for Paul means freedom from sin, from law and from death. It is this which he subjects to careful examination and which he finds wanting, particularly the conclusion (or assumption) of so many commentators that freedom from the law was a central and primary element in Paul's theology. His procedure is straightforward: to examine the references to *eleutheria* in the Pauline letters in chronological sequence. That means effectively in the four *Hauptbriefe* (since the concept does not appear in the Thessalonian correspondence), and in the order 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians and Romans (since he thinks Galatians is later than the Corinthian epistles). Each usage is set against its *religionsgeschichtliche* background and exegeted accordingly.

The results are striking. (1) Paul's usage draws on a variety of backgrounds. In particular, Gal 4,26 and Rom 8,21 show dependence on Hellenistic Jewish thought, with *eleutheria* in the sense of "freedom from decay"; Gal 2,4; 5,13 and Rom 8,2 show Stoic-Cynic influence, with *eleutheria* in the sense "freedom to do what you will"; normal socio-political usage is evident in 1 Cor 7,21-22; 12,13; Gal 3,28 and 4,22-23; in 1 Cor 9,19 the thought is of freedom as financial independence, in some apparent dependence on Socratic tradition blended with the idea of self-sacrifice as in Euripides; and in

1 Cor 9,1; 10,29 and 2 Cor 3,17 *eleutheria* appears more as equivalent to *parrhesia* (boldness). (2) Paul does not simply take over the idea of freedom from earlier Christian tradition (baptismal or other). His earliest understanding was probably that evident in Gal 4,26 and Rom 8,21, which he may have shared with Jewish apocalyptic tradition before his conversion. Otherwise the influence of Greek traditions is unmistakable. (3) In Galatians Paul seems to take up something from the Corinthian view of freedom, as freedom from others' opinions, applied by Paul in Galatians to his opponents' opinions that it is necessary to accept the requirements of the Jewish law. (4) But only with Rom 7,3 do we see the emergence of the idea of "freedom from the law" as such. "Freedom from the law" can therefore not be regarded as the origin of Paul's theology of freedom. (5) The thought of freedom plays neither a central or decisive, nor an essential role in Paul's theology.

The introductory chapter sets up the issues very clearly. The object of the investigation is to determine the origin and place of the idea of freedom within Paul's theology. The one serious flaw in the review of earlier work is the omission of one of the best studies in this area over the past quarter century — R. N. Longenecker, *Paul, Apostle of Liberty* (New York 1964).

Chapter 2 is a very brief (2 pages) treatment of the chronological sequence of the Pauline letters. The main consideration is the testimony of 1 Cor 16,1 (Galatia's participation in the collection): Jones thinks it "improbable" that the Galatian problems could have emerged and been resolved in the period prior to 1 Corinthians. That judgment begs many questions — not least the effect of the letter on the Galatians themselves. The fact that it was kept and evidently treasured by the recipients may well mean that its argument had proved very decisive in the Galatian churches. The failure of Rom 15,26 to mention contributions from Galatia may not be significant, on the other hand, since there is no sign in that passage that Paul intended to provide a complete list of the contributors to the collection.

It is somewhat unfortunate that Jones has not attempted to provide a more solid basis for his view of the letters' sequence. For, obviously, his conclusion that Paul in Galatians may show some influence of Corinthian ideas of freedom depends on 1 Corinthians preceding Galatians. And a different conclusion on chronology would point in the quite opposite direction — that the *Corinthians* were taking up *Paul's* talk of freedom (in Galatians), as Drane has argued. More important for his thesis, the setting of the Corinthian epistles before Galatians makes it easier for him to maintain the position that Galatians does not really have freedom from the law in view as such, a position harder to maintain from Galatians alone. Nevertheless, it is quite proper for a thesis to assume a certain chronological sequence of Paul's letters as a working hypothesis and in effect to test that hypothesis by seeing how well it explains the data. And, at the very least, it can be fairly said that Jones has succeeded in explaining the data with a fair degree of plausibility on the basis of that hypothesis.

In chapter 3, "*eleutheria* in the Corinthian letters", the key passages are subjected to a sequence of incisive studies. Stoic and Cynic parallels show

that the thought of freedom as independent of status (slavery) was common in Hellenism; though Paul, of course, has the specifically Christian thought that Christ is the one who establishes that freedom (1 Cor 7,22). In such a treatment there is always the danger of assuming that analogy denotes genealogy. But here the case seems sound.

Less compelling is the attempt to explain 1 Cor 9,19 as a topos drawn from Socratic tradition blended with the motif of self-offering from Euripides. Neither strand explains Paul's language, "I have made myself slave to all". There may be some ground for Jones's questioning of a background in martyr theology, though that is surely present elsewhere in Paul (particularly Rom 5,6ff). But more attention should have been given to the possibility that an *imitatio Christi* motif was the dominant influence here, as it is so strong in Phil 2,6 and Mark 10,43-45 (both using slave imagery), and explicitly in Rom 15,1-3.7-8, using the parallel "servant" imagery. Jones notes the possibility of some such influence without recognizing its full weight.

Equally unsatisfactory is the attempt to explain the talk of freedom in 1 Cor 9,1 and 10,29 wholly against the background of a Cynic freedom in reference to indiscriminate eating, on the basis of a kind of monotheism. That parallels can be drawn is clearly shown. But parallels are less impressive when they are taken out of context. And the context in 1 Cor 8ff. has a much stronger Jewish character than Jones allows. To be sure it is possible to argue that "the weak" are Gentile Christians (p. 58) — hence, "freedom from Gentile superstition regarding the gods" (p. 77). But in the closely parallel treatment of Rom 14, "the weak" are almost certainly Jewish Christians in the main; apart from anything else, the category of "clean" and "unclean" food (Rom 14,14) is almost exclusively Jewish. And right in the middle of the discussion in 1 Cor 8-10 Paul speaks of his freedom as freedom to live as a Jew or not, as under the law or not, as weak or not (1 Cor 9,19-23 — here the failure to set in context is particularly glaring). In that context it is likely that the "weakness" of Christian conscience regarding idol food was the result of a Hellenistic Judaism long and passionately opposed to anything which related to idolatry. There is no need to push the pendulum wholly the other way; indeed, it is the one-sided either-or-ness of Jones's argument to which I am objecting. The point is, that if the conscience of (some of) the weak was determined in part at least by fear of breaching the (Jewish) law against idolatry, then bound up with the idea of freedom to eat all things was the idea of freedom from the law (the law against idolatry, but also the dietary laws).

The thesis that freedom from the law is not the basis of Paul's idea of freedom and does not even appear, properly speaking, before Romans, is likely to find most difficulty in Galatians. However Jones is able to maintain the position with surprising vigour and to considerable effect. The freedom of Gal 2,4 is really freedom from other people's opinions, freedom to act without undue influence from others. In this case, of course, the opinions are those of the "false brothers", and concern the necessity of observing the requirements of the law. But the concept of freedom as such is wider and different from the particular idea of freedom from the law (p. 81). In 4,22ff. the governing antithesis is that between heavenly Jerusalem and pre-

sent Jerusalem (4,26), where freedom means freedom from transitoriness. Likewise the contrast between the time before the law and the time under the law appears to have been influenced by the Cynic idea of the golden age. Even in Gal 5,1 freedom is something more comprehensive than freedom from the law, since it stands in contrast to a more comprehensive concept of slavery, including slavery to the elements. And in 5,13 it is once again the idea of "freedom to do what one wants".

All this is impressively argued. But the force of the argument is largely vitiated once again by failure to take full account of the context of the references examined. The exegesis is too atomistic. One would never think from Jones's discussion that *nomos* is such a dominant feature in Galatians. More to the point, one would never think from Jones's exposition that Paul speaks of "dying to the law", of being "redeemed from the curse of the law" or from "under the law", or of being "held in custody under the law" (Gal 2,19; 3,13.23; 4,5). Freedom from the law, as such, is much more to the forefront of the argument in Galatians than Jones allows. Moreover, to define freedom in Galatians as "freedom from other's opinions" does not give enough weight to the social character of the law within Jewish(-Christian) self-understanding and praxis. Freedom in Gal 2,4 is not merely freedom from certain individuals' opinions, but from what might be better described as a "nomistic mind-set", from a life-style determined by the characteristic Jewish understanding of the law (including circumcision) as specifying how the people of God should live. As the language cited just above indicates, that concept of freedom could be equally and quite properly expressed as a freedom from the law, that is from the death it entailed or "custody" it provided. So too in 4,22ff. the equation of Hagar with the Sinai covenant, "bearing children for slavery", and with "the present Jerusalem" needs to be given more weight than Jones allows, since none of Paul's Jewish contemporaries could have read the allegory without taking the clear inference that those who lived their lives in terms of the law given at Sinai lived in a form of slavery.

Similar points have to be made with reference to the treatment of Romans. The discussion of 6,18-22 is sound, including the observation of the surprising use of freedom imagery for the non-Christian state (6,20). So too that of 8,21 — freedom from transitoriness — as a concept Paul may well have known before his conversion. But the claim that 7,3 provides the earliest Pauline formulation of the idea of "freedom from the law" has already been called in question by the above critique. And the treatment of 8,2, while noting its dependence on the preceding context (p. 125), hardly takes account of the degree to which chapter 7 as a whole, or at least 7,6ff., can be properly characterized as a "defence of the law". The Cynic and Stoic parallels to the idea of a law which makes free are certainly illuminating. And the talk of being unable to do what one wants (7,15ff.) makes a suggestive link to the idea of freedom as freedom to do what one wants. But at least equally to the point is the fact that Paul also speaks of being freed "from the law of sin and death" (8,2), where the law must mean the law manipulated by sin to serve as a means to death (7,7-11), and where it is the Jewish law as exemplified by the tenth

commandment of the decalogue which is clearly in view. The train of argument is of course more complex, but the thought of "freedom from the law" is clearly involved in some sense, and in a passage which Paul portrays as typical everyman experience.

In short what we have in this volume is a classic *tour de force*, with the classic strengths and weaknesses — too strong a determination to push through a particular line of argument, without sufficient regard for context and other considerations. The strengths are well displayed in the amassing of *religionsgeschichtliche* parallels, but the too-blinkered approach weakens the case overall. What in the end has been demonstrated is that there are wider dimensions and overtones in Paul's talk of freedom than has usually been recognized. But the attempt to push the idea of "freedom from the law" to a late and peripheral stage in Paul's thinking is made at too great a cost to exegetical fidelity.

University of Durham
Abbey House
Palace Green
Durham DH1 3RS England

James D. G. DUNN

Ugo VANNI, *L'Apocalisse*. Ermeneutica, esegesi, teologia (Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 17). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1988. 432 p. 16,5 × 23,9. Lit. 50.000.

U. Vanni est l'un des plus remarquables spécialistes de l'Apocalypse. C'est dire tout l'intérêt que l'on apporte à sa nouvelle publication qui vient enrichir une série déjà impressionnante d'études sur le sujet.

Ce livre se dérobant à toute classification, le mieux est de commencer par rendre compte de son contenu réparti en 3 grands chapitres.

La 1^{ère} partie envisage l'Apocalypse (Ap) dans son ensemble, la considère dans sa structure et relève les grandes constantes symboliques et les caractères généraux du langage symbolique employé.

Il est remarquable que le livre s'ouvre sur un dialogue liturgique entre un lecteur et une assemblée cultuelle: c'est à elle que s'adresse l'Ap, c'est elle qui est invitée à entendre la véritable signification des symboles. Car si un symbole peut être traduit en concepts, cette démarche se révèle fortement réductrice. Elle ne demande plus du destinataire cette attention qui recherche le point d'insertion du symbole dans la situation contemporaine. L'assemblée cultuelle (assimilable à l'Eglise) est invitée dans l'Ap à déchiffrer le mystère, c'est-à-dire le plan de Dieu dans l'histoire contemporaine, et à y trouver l'interpellation d'un Dieu qui attend de son peuple une obéissance concrète. En même temps que cette exigence est signifiée la grande nouveauté: la fidélité demandée doit être vécue dans l'assurance de participer à la victoire du Christ vainqueur de la mort.

Tout le corps de l'Ap est bien à comprendre dans cette perspective: le livre qui s'ouvre sur un dialogue liturgique se clôt de même. Le culte est alors porté à son accomplissement: Dieu lui-même intervient et l'assemblée, sous l'inspiration de l'Esprit, lui donne le répons de la foi: Viens! L'Ap est donc bien un livre dont le but est de provoquer dans l'assemblée cultuelle une prise de conscience de sa vocation et un engagement de foi.

Toutes ces observations sont importantes pour l'interprétation des différentes péripécies du livre dont elles fournissent le cadre d'une juste compréhension. Il paraît sage de préciser, ce que U.V. ne refuserait sans doute pas, que l'assemblée liturgique qu'il nous montre appelée au décodage des symboles, est la figure même de l'Eglise du temps. En conséquence il ne s'agit pas pour elle de découvrir, en une aventure herméneutique nouvelle, un message inconnu. Au contraire, la situation cultuelle des différentes visions doit être prise au sérieux: c'est la liturgie qui est le garant de l'intelligence d'un langage reçu par une tradition éprouvée.

La 2^{ème} partie de l'étude est consacrée à l'exégèse de quelques péripécies choisies comme particulièrement représentatives des grandes sections de l'Ap et des principaux «personnages» mis en scène.

- Le dialogue liturgique d'Ap 1,4-8 prépare l'assemblée et à la purification pénitentielle (qui sera le thème majeur de la 1^{ère} partie de l'Ap), et au discernement de la conduite qu'il lui faudra tenir (objet de la 2^{ème} partie) pour mener à la liturgie finale.

- Ap 1,9-16 présente l'Eglise dans son être véritable; les candélabres la définissent comme assemblée liturgique, les étoiles disent son caractère transcendant pour autant qu'elle se trouve dans la main du ressuscité. Celui-ci est décrit comme le prêtre médiateur parfait, puisque sa description emprunte plusieurs traits que les prophètes attribuent à Dieu lui-même.

- La Lettre à Laodicée (3,14-22) est retenue comme échantillon de l'interprétation des Lettres aux Eglises. U.V. y cherche à juste titre des allusions à la situation concrète de l'Eglise, mais il le fait, après trop d'exégètes, sur le plan anecdotique, ce qui est, à mon sens, une voie sans issue: comment expliquer les phrases sur la richesse et l'orgueil de *l'Eglise* par des allusions à la situation économique de *la ville*? Comment justifier la violente condamnation de la tiédeur comme mal suprême, alors que le mot même implique un reste de vie? C'est qu'il s'agit d'une image non pas empruntée aux caractéristiques de la région où existent des sources chaudes, mais bien au contexte religieux du temps: le principal danger qui menace les Eglises est, selon l'auteur de l'Ap, la tiédeur qui admet le mélange entre la fidélité à Dieu et l'idolâtrie qui imprègne le monde.

- De la 1^{ère} grande vision U.V. retient Ap 5,6-8, ce qui lui permet d'étudier la figure christologique de l'agneau. L'image lui semble choisie en référence principale à l'agneau pascal, reprenant les données du 4^{ème} évangile dont la théologie se trouve développée et menée à son accomplissement: le symbole s'enrichit des allusions à la royauté du crucifié et à la possession de l'Esprit (mais le 4^{ème} évangile n'affirme-t-il pas tout cela?). Le livre scellé est compris comme contenant le plan de Dieu pour le monde pour la seule raison qu'il se trouve dans sa droite, ce qui est peut-être une justification insuffisante! Mais l'essentiel est de noter qu'inaccessible

aux hommes, il est réalisé (et pas seulement révélé) par le Christ. Quant aux anciens, leur évidente parenté avec les hommes conduit U.V. à les identifier aux saints présents et futurs qui participent à l'aide apportée par le Christ aux siens.

- L'interprétation du 3^{ème} sceau (Ap 6,5-6) comme symbolisant l'injustice sociale approche sans doute de la vérité, même si elle s'accompagne de remarques contestables: la condamnation de Babylone n'est pas fondée sur l'injustice qui y règne, mais bien sur son idolâtrie!

- L'exégèse d'Ap 12,1-6 est intéressante: la femme est le peuple de Dieu appelé, comme jadis dans l'AT, à donner le salut messianique au monde au prix de redoutables difficultés. Jésus naît de ce peuple dans la phase pré-eschatologique du salut. On peut parler d'une croissance du Christ à quoi l'Eglise prend part. Elle est donc appelée à continuer l'incarnation, faisant naître le Christ dans le monde jusqu'à l'eschaton où il conclura l'histoire du salut. L'interprétation mariale de la femme-mère du messie n'est retenable que dans une 2^{ème} lecture.

- Avec le chapitre 21, dont les versets 1 à 8 sont étudiés, nous sommes dans la phase eschatologique qui connaît un développement progressif: cieux et terre sont d'abord renouvelés séparément pour laisser finalement place à un monde nouveau dont la Jérusalem nouvelle, résidence unique pour Dieu et les hommes, est le parfait symbole.

Après ces aperçus exégétiques partiels, la 3^{ème} partie apporte une synthèse attendue. Cette attente est comblée: on trouve là, non seulement une présentation de la théologie de l'Ap, mais sa magistrale mise en perspective dans le cadre général de la théologie johannique.

Dans tous les chapitres qui rendent compte de cette théologie, U.V. propose de déceler un développement qui part du 4^{ème} évangile pour s'épanouir dans l'Ap. Ainsi de la royauté du Christ: l'évangile de Jean affirme fortement le règne du Christ. C'est un règne qui n'est décelable que par la foi, car il n'est pas de ce monde. La révélation en est donnée sur la croix. Mais Jean s'arrête à ces affirmations. Il n'envisage pas le développement de ce royaume et notamment ses relations avec l'histoire des hommes. En revanche l'Ap poursuit la réflexion en affirmant la vocation des chrétiens à continuer l'œuvre messianique du Christ. Dans le monde où ils vivent, ils sont appelés à prolonger le règne du Christ qui seul donne son sens à l'histoire. C'est pourquoi la théologie de l'Ap est dynamique: elle affirme l'incompatibilité des deux royaumes (du monde et du Christ), mais annonce la victoire du Christ sur le monde. La croix et les chrétiens martyrs en sont les signes à déchiffrer, mais l'histoire verra la révélation du roi des rois.

Chez Jean l'annonce de la venue, ou plutôt de la présence de l'heure du Christ, indique la glorification par laquelle Jésus donne la vie à ceux qui l'accueillent. Mais on laisse entendre qu'il y aura un jugement et la résurrection est attendue. Il y a là pour le moins une ambiguïté et Jean ne fait rien pour la lever.

Le message de l'Ap intègre, ici encore, la période présente dans l'histoire du salut en lui réservant une place particulière: certes l'Ap annonce, elle aussi, que le Christ est présent. Mais par ses appels répétés à demeurer dans

cette communion sans cesse menacée et à vivre au sein du monde en témoins de ce Seigneur présent, elle répète sans cesse qu'il vient et que les chrétiens doivent être les signes de cette venue. Ils en sont les arrhes et l'incarnation, précisément dans les situations conflictuelles qui les effrayent.

Ils sont appelés à discerner dans l'histoire des hommes et celle de chacun d'entre eux la réalisation de la venue du Christ vainqueur du mal. Ils annoncent ainsi le sens christologique de l'histoire et la portée historique de la personne du Christ. Ils trouvent là un puissant encouragement à œuvrer avec leur maître en marchant vers l'achèvement.

Autrement dit nous avons dans le «cercle johannique» plusieurs théologies ou plutôt un développement théologique. Il est particulièrement évident sur le point de la relation du Christ à l'histoire. Chez Jean le Christ est présent parmi les hommes depuis l'incarnation. Il a donc une relation claire à l'histoire, mais la question n'est pas développée. On se contente d'affirmer l'actualité du salut et de parler du futur.

Dans l'Ap le Christ présent depuis l'incarnation accompagne l'histoire dans un développement conjoint: sa venue n'est pas attendue comme un surgissement imprévisible, mais comme le terme d'une évolution qui voit les forces de renouveau et de résurrection se manifester avec une puissance toujours plus active. Au terme du développement, il y aura enfin coïncidence entre l'histoire renouvelée et le Christ ressuscité.

La différence qu'il y a entre les eschatologies johanniques s'explique par le degré de profondeur de la conscience que l'on a du rapport entre le Christ et l'Histoire.

Arrivé à ce point l'exposé théologique change assez radicalement d'objet bien que demeure le fil conducteur qui suit le développement conduisant de Jean à l'Ap. On aborde en effet la mariologie. L'étude des deux textes majeurs de Jean (2,3-4 et 19,26-27) conduit U.V. à déceler dans le 4^{ème} évangile la marque d'une réflexion qui voit dans la mère de Jésus la «Femme», médiatrice, mère des hommes qui connaissent une nouvelle naissance. Autrement dit Marie est type de l'Eglise. Cette exégèse amène alors l'auteur à effectuer une 2^{ème} lecture d'Ap 12: la «femme», mère du messie, symbole du peuple de Dieu dans toute l'histoire du salut, trouve en Marie un type dont il faut souligner la dimension ecclésiale.

Après cette brève présentation, revenons sur notre 1^{ère} remarque: comment définir ce livre? Ce n'est pas une monographie consacrée à un texte ou un thème de l'Ap, bien que la 3^{ème} partie soit principalement occupée par une étude sur les eschatologies du johannisme. Ce n'est pas non plus un commentaire, bien que les exégèses partielles qui sont proposées présupposent souvent une interprétation de la totalité de l'Ap. La 1^{ère} partie n'est pas non plus ce que l'on a coutume d'appeler une introduction à l'Ap, bien qu'elle en aborde plusieurs thèmes traditionnels.

Le lecteur en vient ainsi à se demander ce que l'auteur a voulu faire. La réponse à cette question est forcément marquée de subjectivité. Néanmoins plusieurs indices tendent à montrer que nous sommes ici devant une œuvre préparatoire: à la page 14, U.V. annonce un commentaire de l'Ap. Nous l'attendons avec grande impatience. Mais l'auteur ne veut céder à aucune précipitation. Mieux, il ébauche les grandes lignes du futur édifice comme un

architecte soumet au jugement d'autrui l'esquisse qu'il crée peu à peu. C'est ce qui explique à la fois les fortes qualités du livre et certaines de ses faiblesses.

Commençons par ces dernières: l'auteur, ne se pliant pas aux règles traditionnelles d'un genre littéraire établi, oscille entre plusieurs formules. Tantôt il discute pied à pied, commençant par faire l'état de la question, alléguant un argument avancé par un exégète, l'éprouvant, proposant éventuellement une autre solution, bref il nous offre alors des pages d'exégèse. Mais la plupart du temps il ne s'attarde pas à ces démarches habituelles de la science exégétique et se contente d'affirmer sa position (parfois même le développement s'élargit à des considérations de type quasi homilétique, ce qui n'est pas chose honteuse, ni même mineure, mais demande à être étayé sur une solide base exégétique). Pour le lecteur attentif les justifications apparaissent sous-entendues, mais pour un auteur qui appelle les réactions des autres, le procédé a de quoi surprendre. Le choix de très courtes péripécies comme échantillons de l'interprétation proposée accentue naturellement ce caractère: comment rendre compte des 3 versets d'Ap 5,6-8 sans se livrer par exemple à une étude sérieuse des 4 animaux en envisageant non seulement leur provenance (la vision d'Ez 1), mais encore l'interprétation de cette vision dans le Judaïsme de l'époque...?

De même on aimerait voir justifier qu'après avoir insisté sur l'unité des 4 premiers sceaux (les 4 cavaliers), l'auteur affirme simplement que le premier d'entre eux (le cavalier blanc) symbolise le Christ et non une calamité comme les 3 suivants.

De même de la 4^{ème} trompette où la plaie qui frappe le soleil, la lune et les étoiles est comprise comme une atteinte au cadre de la vie humaine.

De même lorsque la lune sur laquelle se tient la femme d'Ap 12 est prise comme expression de la supratemporalité de l'Eglise (la lune étant la base du calendrier). Ce n'est là qu'une possibilité et sans doute pas la plus vraisemblable. D'où la nécessité d'une justification, absente ici.

De même lorsque le désert où fuit la femme est pris dans le sens de refuge, alors que tout le symbolisme biblique invite à entendre la double connotation: refuge/épreuve.

De même quand le chiffre de 1260 est simplement compris comme exprimant le caractère partiel de la durée, alors que son origine prophétique (Daniel) y fait vibrer de très riches harmoniques.

Ces raccourcis dans l'exposition font parfois négliger des travaux décisifs sur certains textes. Citons par exemple l'étude d'A. Strobel si déterminante sur le sens symbolique de l'allusion au Cantique des cantiques 5,2 en Ap 3,20 et dans le Judaïsme contemporain (*Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem auf Grund der spätjüdisch-urchristlichen Geschichte von Habakuk 2,2ss.* [Leiden-Köln 1961]). Je profite de l'occasion pour annoncer le travail, en voie d'achèvement, que H. Ulfsgard consacre au thème de la fête des Tabernacles dans l'Ap et qui amènera à prêter plus d'attention à des textes comme Ap 21,3-4 (cf. U.V. page 270) et 7,9-17 qui s'éclairent d'une lumière nouvelle lorsqu'on y décèle l'écho d'une théologie inspirée de la symbolique de la fête.

Mais ce sont là critiques de détail qui trouveront leur réponse dans le commentaire annoncé.

Plus intéressantes sont les questions posées par la partie théologique: on y trouve en effet la pensée de U.V. parvenue à une maturité certaine. Je ferai à cet égard deux remarques, l'une sous forme de question, l'autre plus critique.

- L'une des bases sur lesquelles repose l'édifice est l'affirmation d'un développement théologique allant du 4^{ème} évangile à l'Ap. Je ne soulèverai pas la question sous l'angle historique (la tradition place la rédaction de l'Ap avant celle de l'évangile), mais bien sur le plan proprement théologique. En deux mots (mais cela mériterait un ample débat), l'eschatologie de l'Ap, liée qu'elle est encore à la forme des apocalypses juives, ne s'explique-t-elle pas mieux comme l'ébauche d'une théologie qui trouvera son épanouissement dans le 4^{ème} évangile? Il ne faut en effet pas se laisser prendre au jeu des apparences: la temporalité est dans l'Ap l'objet d'une profonde mutation, comme les autres valeurs humaines. Dès lors ce que U.V. présente comme l'annonce d'un développement des forces de résurrection dans l'histoire du monde ne serait-il pas à comprendre plutôt comme l'affirmation de l'irruption dans cette histoire temporelle du Dieu qui est maître du temps? Ainsi seulement peut-on, me semble-t-il, résoudre la difficulté sinon insoluble des répétitions/variantes qui proclament tout au long de l'Ap par exemple que le royaume est déjà là et qu'il est pourtant à venir.

Parler à ce propos de stade pré-eschatologique me semble être une tentative désespérée de faire entrer la théologie de l'Ap dans le cadre étroit de la logique humaine. Le message ne serait-il pas plutôt que l'homme doit recevoir révélation de ce qu'est vraiment le temps, parce qu'il participe de cette nouvelle création où toutes choses reçoivent leur valeur non plus de l'homme, mais de Dieu?

Je laisse aux spécialistes du 4^{ème} évangile le soin d'apprécier si la présentation de son eschatologie est satisfaisante. J'aurais pour ma part tendance à considérer la théologie johannique de l'évangile comme l'approfondissement d'un message que l'Ap ne réussit à énoncer qu'en des approximations successives, employant les catégories de l'apocalyptique, mais en leur faisant violence pour les rendre aptes à révéler plus que ce qu'elles ne disent. Dans le 4^{ème} évangile le même message s'énonce, mais dans une langue symbolique épurée et portée à l'extrême limite de ce qu'un langage humain peut dire de Dieu. Ce n'est pas un hasard si la tradition patristique continuée dans les icônes orthodoxes appelle Jean *le* théologien: c'est vraiment celui auquel il a été donné de parler de Dieu.

- Quant à la critique elle portera, qui s'en étonnerait, sur le chapitre mariologique. Si je suis tout prêt à reconnaître que Marie joue dans les évangiles un rôle qui dépasse son personnage historique, la lecture ecclésiale des deux textes de Jean (2,3-4 et 19,26-27) ne me paraît être qu'une hypothèse. Une seule remarque en passant: si dans le 2^{ème} texte Marie était vraiment figure de l'Eglise, pourquoi ne lit-on pas qu'il lui appartient de recevoir chez elle l'apôtre, et non l'inverse qui se trouve dans le texte? En conséquence il me paraît aventuré de revenir sur l'exégèse d'Ap 12 qui proposait une interprétation de la femme/peuple de Dieu pour en faire une nouvelle lecture

mariologique pour la seule raison que l'Eglise/peuple de Dieu est typifiée en Marie dans le 4^{ème} évangile.

Tout ceci veut montrer l'extrême intérêt de ce volume riche, énigmatique parce qu'il ne livre que partiellement des analyses que l'on doit parfois deviner, original dans ses conclusions théologiques qui ne manqueront pas, selon le vœu de l'auteur, de susciter la discussion. Mais on peut être assuré que le débat se situera d'emblée à un haut niveau, parce que les questions sont justement posées au fond. De cela on doit exprimer à U.V. une très vive reconnaissance.

Université de Strasbourg
Faculté de Théologie Protestante
F-67084 Strasbourg Cedex
France

Pierre PRIGENT

Johannes P. LOUW - Eugene A. NIDA (eds.), *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains*. Volume 1: Introduction and Domains. Volume 2: Indices. New York, United Bible Societies, 1988. xxv-843 p.; iv-375 p. 18 x 24,5.

This is a beautiful book. Handsomely bound, it is printed in clear, readable type with generous spacing. It is also, at the present moment, a unique book in that it is the only lexicon of the Greek NT based on semantic domains. Its contents are an outgrowth of vast field experience and research. Everyone who is interested in the Greek NT will find here information of great value though the lexicon is designed primarily for translators. It was for these that the lexicon was created and it will be of most service to them. Others will find that some of the entries contain information which is of interest but only marginally useful.

The Introduction is a model of clarity among linguistic and semantic writings. It avoids much of the difficult terminology and succeeds in making intelligible to the reader the kind of material which in many books and articles is clear only to the student who is initiated into the not infrequently obscure terminology of semanticists. Since this is a new type of lexicon, it seems in place to give a summary of the Introduction which purposes to help the readers use the lexicon and to help them understand the principles which it employs.

I. Significant features of the lexicon. It is unique because based on the concept of semantic domains and because of the way in which the domains are organized. In classifying the meanings it first of all distinguishes unique referents (proper names); class referents or common words, whose meanings designate a class of entities, events, or abstracts; and, finally, markers, usually prepositions and particles, words which serve primarily to mark relationships between content words, phrases, and clauses.

Three major classes of semantic features serve as the basis for the various domains and subdomains. *Shared* features, the elements of the meaning of the lexical items which are held in common. *Distinctive* features serve to separate meanings one from another. *Supplementary* features are ones which may be relevant in certain contexts or may play a connotative or associative role. Here the examples are given of κολαφίζω, ραβδίζω μαστίζω and μαστιγώ all of which share the features of physical impact involving hitting or striking. The distinctive feature of κολαφίζω is that the hitting is done with the fist, ραβδίζω is distinctive in involving beating with a stick or rod. The final two designate beating with a whip. In addition they frequently refer to officially sanctioned punishments.

One of the most helpful features of the lexicon is that meanings are indicated by definitions based on the distinctive features of the term, and not merely by glosses which suggest ways a term may be represented in English. Thus κίνδυνος may be defined as "a state of dangerous and threatening circumstances" and glossed as 'danger', 'peril', and 'risk'.

The lexicon is composed of two volumes. The second volume contains three indices where the user must begin his search. The first index is Greek to English. The Greek term is given and an English gloss or glosses with the number of the domain and the subdomain in the first volume. The second index lists English glosses but is not all-inclusive. The third index lists all the passages of the NT which are cited in the lexicon.

II. Reasons for a new type of lexicon. The main reason, according to the Introduction, is the inadequacy of most existing dictionaries which are limited in indicating meanings, depending principally on a series of glosses. An even more serious problem may be created by the unsystematic way in which these dictionaries treat various meanings. Here the word λόγος from BAGD is cited as an example, and contrasted with the systematic way in which the meanings should have been grouped. It is further pointed out that the fundamental problem may be the failure to distinguish between meaning and reference, a distinction which is clarified in the fourth section of the Introduction.

The new lexicon has the great advantage of bringing together meanings which are closely related in semantic space, sometimes even regarded as partial synonyms. The following words, for example, have related meanings, νοῦς, καρδιά, ψυχή, συνείδησις; φῆν and πνεῦμα, and will, consequently, be found in the same area of the lexicon. On the other hand, the different meanings of πνεῦμα belong to quite different semantic domains and are found in different parts of the lexicon.

This way of grouping meanings has the definite advantage of making the reader aware of the subtle distinctions between lexical items whose meanings are closely related and even overlap.

III. How to Use the Lexicon. The first index of volume two lists the Greek words of the NT. Here one is referred to the numbers of the first volume. For example ὀφθαλμός has the glosses 'eye', 'sight', 'understanding'. In addition eight idioms are listed. Thus one must consult eleven different entries.

The second index lists English words which one may begin with. Not all glosses are listed but the ones chosen refer the reader to a domain where the listed gloss represents a central or core meaning.

The third index serves the reader who wishes to find where a particular text or word of the NT is treated in the lexicon. This index is exhaustive in that it lists every passage of the NT to be found in the lexicon; but, of course, not every verse is there treated. Passages were chosen on the basis of their clarity and their importance for exegesis.

IV. Basic Principles of Semantic Analysis and Classification.

1. There are no synonyms, or, in other words, no two closely-related meanings have exactly the same set of referents, much less the same set of connotative or associative features.

2. Differences in meaning are marked by context, either textual or contextual and it follows that the correct meaning of any term is that which best fits the context.

3. Meaning is defined by a set of distinctive features. It is by means of these features that the range of referents may be defined. It is essential not to confuse the meaning of a term with the particular reference which a term has in a specific context. Thus ὄρνις in Matt 23,37 most probably refers to a hen; but its meaning is "a bird of any kind, either wild or domesticated". More complex is the problem of αἰτέω which may be glossed as 'to ask for, to pray, to demand', but which is best treated as having only one meaning, "to pray for with urgency, even to the point of demanding". Its meaning includes a range which overlaps in English with three types of reference.

Identifying features which constitute connotative or associative meanings is complex and involves a number of dimensions: levels of formality, time, social class, sex, age, and education. But it should be kept in mind that native speakers agree about associative meanings almost to the same extent as they agree about designative meanings.

4. Figurative meanings differ from their bases in three fundamental factors: diversity in domains, awareness of the relationship between literal and figurative meanings, and the extent of conventional usage.

5. Both the different meanings of the same word and the related meanings of different words tend to form irregularly shaped constellations rather than neatly organized structures. Hence it is usually impossible to set up a *Grundbedeutung*, a type of underlying meaning which is to be found in all occurrences of a term.

In NT Greek the sets of terms which have related meanings are often quite unsystematic and for this reason no attempt has been made in this lexicon to try to describe all of these sets. This might be of interest to lexicographers and semanticists but not particularly useful to translators.

The student who desires a fuller explanation is referred to the select bibliography and in particular to the writings of Nida and Louw. I personally would have liked to see more discussion of "meaning" as part of the Introduction, perhaps on the model of *Style and Discourse* p.69-82. But I can appreciate the good reasons for limiting the theoretical explanations.

Section III of the Introduction has an important critique of the unsystematic classification found in the usual dictionaries. Page ix clearly explains the advantages of grouping together meanings which are closely related in semantic space. The user of this dictionary will not find on the same page the diverse meanings of λόγος as arranged in BAGD but in compensation he will find in the neighborhood of 35.98 dozens of words having to do with 'speak, talk'.

The fourth part of the Introduction is a model of clarity in exposition. More perhaps might have been said about the semantic grid, "the extent to which one tends to lump or split differences". But the examples of ὄρνις and θήκη illustrate clearly the difference between meaning and referent. Less clear is the example of αἰτέω as a word having one meaning including a range which overlaps (in English) with at least three types of reference.

The authors present a brilliant explanation of their fourth principle of semantic analysis — how figurative meanings differ from their bases. The three fundamental factors are explained with a minimum of technical language. There is, of course, much more to be said about figurative meanings but the student who begins here does well indeed.

The problem of the organized structures of different meanings is touched on briefly. Perhaps something might be added, especially a distinction between a less structured semantic field and a lexical field which would manifest more structure. Quite justifiably the authors point out that the interests of translators are not always conterminous with those of semanticists and lexicographers.

This dictionary is so valuable and prepared with such care that I hope it will not be ungracious to point out some of the problems I encountered in using it for subjects of interest to me at the moment.

A problem about the usage of εἰς and ἐν involved checking many different entries. Here the standard dictionaries, though not so complete or so logically arranged, were easier to consult. The use of the preposition in phrases such as ἐκ πίστεως (Gal 3,9) was not, as far as I could find, listed under ἐκ, though what I was searching is found in 31.86 and 11.51. The meaning given in 89.3 comes close but is not so clear as BAGD 3.d. ὑπέρ as meaning 'in place of' (Phlm 13) is not noted.

I am convinced that ἀρχομαι, especially in Marcan usage, means more than "to initiate an action, process, or state of being" (68,1) and "a point of time at the beginning of a duration" (67.65). Neither of the entries for ἀποκρίνομαι takes account of the usage exemplified in Mark 6,37. The four entries for καί do not indicate the richness of this marker. The first meaning of ἀποστέλλω is "to cause someone to depart for a particular purpose", glossed 'to send'. This does not make explicit the not infrequent meaning of *causing, having* something done as noted in BAGD 1.d. 23.94 notes that it may be necessary to express the agent for ἠγέρθη (Matt 28,6). Quite possibly; but the alternate explanation as a passive deponent might be noted, see Acts 9,8.

I do not wish to give a negative impression about a work that is so valuable. So much is positive. In general I have a feeling that some of the

meanings are too precise, too full. I hope that nobody is planning an edition of the Greek NT which would refer every word to a certain domain. It does not seem desirable to have a mechanical "versio recepta". As it is, this dictionary will help to correct many oversights and will exact precise thinking. To all who collaborated: εὐχαριστῶ.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

John J. WELCH

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 1988-1989. II semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 322, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	19	270	28	317
Fac. Orientalistica	—	2	3	5
Universi	19	272	31	322
Nationes	57	Alumni		322
Dioceses	161	Alumni		169
Inst. Religiosorum	52	Alumni		121
Inst. Religiosarum	15	Alumnae		15
Ex statu laicali	17	Alumnae		11
		Alumni		6

Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

HAŁAS, Stanisław, S.C.J. (01.03.1989). *Risurrezione e vita secondo la prima lettera di Pietro* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: A. VANHOYE.

KOLARCIK, Michael, S.J. (29.05.1989). *The Ambiguity of Death in the Book of Wisdom 1-6* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: M. GILBERT.

LO, William Pak-Huen, S.J. (14.04.1989). *Conversion and Salvation. A Narrative and Stylistic Analysis of Judges 6-7* (Cum laude). Moderator: J. L. SKA.

MULLOOR, Augustine, O.C.D. (26.05.1989). *Jesus' Prayer of Praise. A Study of the Meaning and Function of Mt 11,25-30 in the First Gospel* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: F. LENTZEN-DEIS.

Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:

LO, William Pak-Huen, S.J., *Conversion and Salvation. A Narrative and Stylistic Analysis of Judges 6-7* (extractum). Rome 1989.

MORLA ASENSIO, Victor, *El fuego en el Antiguo Testamento. Estudio de semántica lingüística* (Institución San Jerónimo 21). Valencia-Bilbao 1988.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

Omnes libri ad Directionem missi quodam modo cum rebus biblicis connexi in hoc elencho notantur. Praeterea mandantur redactori *Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography* et in eodem *Elencho bibliographico* notantur prout redactori bonum videtur.

Eo autem quod hi libri in *Biblica* recipiuntur, nullum de iis exprimitur iudicium.

Recensiones de libris aut fient aut non fient, prout Moderatori recensio-num opportunum videbitur.

Libri ad Directionem missi, quos Directio periodici non directe recensio-nis gratia expetiverit, numquam remittuntur, etsi de eis recensio non fit.

Libri mittantur ad «Directio *Biblica*, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italia».

Vetus Testamentum

Alexandre, Monique, *Le commencement du Livre Genèse I-V. La version grecque de la Septante et sa réception* (Christianisme Antique 3). Paris, Beauchesne, 1988. 408 p. 15,5 × 24. 372 FF.

Bizjak, Jurij, *Job*. Koper, Ognjišče, 1989. 160 p. 11,5 × 16,8.

Broyles, Craig C., *The Conflict of Faith and Experience in the Psalms. A Form-Critical and Theological Study* (JSOT Supplement Series 52). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1989. 272 p. 14,2 × 22,1. £25.00/\$42.50.

Carroll, Robert P., *Jeremiah* (JSOT Old Testament Guides). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1989. 128 p. 13,5 × 21,5.

The Commentary of Rabbi Abraham Ibn Ezra on Hosea. Edited from Six Manuscripts and Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Abe Lipshitz. New York, Sepher-Hermon Press, Inc., 1988. 187 p. 16 × 23,5. \$19.95.

Day, Peggy L., *An Adversary in Heaven. šāṭān in the Hebrew Bible* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 43). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1988. xi-177 p. 14,5 × 22,3. \$17.95.

Diez Macho, Alexander (ed.), *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia*. Series IV. Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum. L. 1 Genesis. Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1988. 578 p. 22 × 31,5.

Hilaire de Poitiers, *Commentaire sur le Psaume 118*. Tome II (Sources Chrétiennes 347). Texte critique, traduction, index et notes par Marc Milhau. Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1988. 331 p. 12,5 × 19,5. 205 FF.

The Holy Bible. The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah (Annotated Critical Translation from the Original Languages by the Studium Biblicum Franciscanum). Tokyo, Chuo Shuppansha, 1988. 181 p. 15,5 × 21.

Jean Chrysostome, *Commentaire sur Job*. Tome II (Chapitres XV-XLII). Texte critique, traduction, notes et index par Henri Sorlin avec la collaboration de Louis Neyrand, s.j. (Sources Chrétiennes 348). Paris, Le Cerf, 1988. 312 p. 12,4 × 19,5. 190,00 F.

Joyce, Paul, *Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezechiel* (JSOT Supplement Series 51). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1989. 186 p. 14,2 × 22,1. £25.00/\$42.50.

Keel, Othmar. *Das Hohelied* (Zürcher Bibelkommentare AT 18). Zürich, Theologischer Verlag, 1986. 268 p. 15,4 × 23,4. SFr. 33,50.

Langer, Birgit, *Gott als "Licht" in Israel und Mesopotamien*. Eine Studie zu Jes 60,1-3.19f (Österreichische Biblische Studien 7). Klosterneuburg, Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1989. viii-255 p. 14,7 × 20,8. DM 29,40/SFr 25,50.

Nielsen, Kirsten, *There is Hope for a Tree*. The Tree as Metaphor in Isaiah (JSOT Supplement Series 65). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1989. 301 p. 14 × 22. £20.50/\$31.95.

Olyan, Saul M., *Asherah and the Cult of Yahweh in Israel* (The Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 34). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1988. xiv-100 p. 15,2 × 22,8.

Rendtorff, Rolf, *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament*. Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1989. 526 p. 13,5 × 18,5. 224 F.

Rogerson, John - **Davies**, Philip, *The Old Testament World*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989. 384 p. 19,8 × 24,5. £19.50.

van Wolde, E. J., *A Semiotic Analysis of Genesis 2-3*. A Semiotic Theory and Method of Analysis Applied to the Story of the Garden of Eden (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 25). Assen, Van Gorcum & Co., 1989. 244 p. 15,5 × 23,8. Dfl. 42,50.

Zenger, Erich. *Das Buch Ruth* (Zürcher Bibelkommentare AT 8). Zürich, Theologischer Verlag, 1986. 128 p. 15,4 × 23,4. SFr. 22,00.

Novum Testamentum

Arnold, Clinton E., *Ephesians: Power and Magic*. The concept of power in Ephesians in light of its historical setting (SNTS Monograph Series 63). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989. xiv-244 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £27.50/\$39.50.

Barbaglio, Giuseppe, *1-2 Corinzi*. (Leggere oggi la Bibbia 2.7). Brescia, Queriniana, 1989. 146 p. 13 × 21. L. 15.000.

Bartolomé, Juan J., *El evangelio y su verdad*. La justificación por la fe y su vivencia en común. Un estudio exegetico de Gal 2,5.14 (Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 82). Roma, Las, 1988. 170 p. 16,5 × 24. L. 20.000.

Black, C. Clifton, *The Disciples according to Mark*. Markan Redaction in Current Debate (JSNT Supplement Series 27). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1989. 392 p. 14,2 × 22. £25.00/\$37.50.

Boers, Hendrikus, *Neither on This Mountain Nor in Jerusalem*. A Study of John 4 (The Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 35). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1988. xv-230 p. 15,2 × 22,8. \$19.95.

Derrett, J. Duncan M., *The Ascetic Discourse*. An Explanation of the Sermon on the Mount. Eilsbrunn, Ko'amar, 1989. 112 p. 15,5 × 23,4. DM 24,80.

de Jong, M., *Paulus, struikelblok of toetssteen*. Een studie van 2 Korintiërs 2:12-4:6 als bijdrage in het gesprek met Israël. Kampen, Mondiss, 1989. 235 p. 15,5 × 23,5. Dfl. 37,50.

Dowd, Sharyn Echols, *Prayer, Power, and the Problem of Suffering: Mark 11:22-25 in the Context of Markan Theology* (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 105). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1988. 186 p. 13,9 × 21,4. \$11.95.

Elliott, J. K., *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts* (SNTS Monograph Series 62). Cambridge University Press, 1989. xxi-210 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £30.00/\$49.50.

Ferraro, Giuseppe, *La gioia di Cristo nel quarto vangelo* (Studi Biblici 83). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1988. 309 p. 13,8 × 20,6. L. 32.000.

Frankemölle, Hubert - Kertelge, Karl (Hrsg.), *Vom Urchristentum zu Jesus*. Für Joachim Gnlika. Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1989. 536 p. 16 × 23,5.

Klauck, Hans-Josef, *Gemeinde - Amt - Sakrament*. Neutestamentliche Perspektiven. Würzburg, Echter, 1989. 452 p. 14 × 22,5. DM 48,—.

Latourelle, René, *The Miracles of Jesus and the Theology of Miracles*. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1988. v-371 p. 15,3 × 22,8. \$14.95.

Légasse, Simon, «*Et qui est mon prochain?*» Etude sur l'agapè dans le Nouveau Testament (Lectio Divina 136). Paris, Le Cerf, 1989. 183 p. 13,5 x 21,5. 125 F.

Lupieri, Edmondo, *Giovanni Battista fra storia e leggenda* (Biblioteca di cultura religiosa 53). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1988. 476 p. 15 x 21. L. 45.000.

Marcus, Joel - Soards, Marion L. (eds.). *Apocalyptic and the New Testament*. Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn (JSNT Supplement Series 24). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1989. 351 p. 14,2 x 22. £25.00/\$42.50.

Newman, Barclay M. - Stine, Philip C., *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Matthew* (Helps for Translators). New York, United Bible Societies, 1988. x-939 p. 16,2 x 23,6. \$13.00.

Odelain, O. - Séguineau, R., *Concordance thématique du Nouveau Testament*. Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1989. 1081 p. 12,5 x 18,5.

Prior, Michael, *Paul the Letter-Writer and the Second Letter to Timothy* (JSOT Supplement Series 23). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1989. 300 p. 14 x 22. £25.00/\$37.50.

Räisänen, Heikki, *Die Mutter Jesu im Neuen Testament* (Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia - Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 247). Helsinki, Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 2. Auflage, 1989. 217 p. 16,5 x 24,4.

Savoca, Gaetano, *Iniziazione all'analisi biblica strutturalista*. Teoria e applicazioni pratiche. Messina, E.S.U.R., 1989. 135 p. 15,5 x 21. L. 12.000.

Schweizer, Eduard, *Jesus Christ. The Man from Nazareth and the Exalted Lord*. London, SCM Press Ltd., 1989. vii-96 p. 14,5 x 21,9. £5.95.

Van Belle, Gilbert, *Johannine Bibliography 1966-1985*. A Cumulative Bibliography on the Fourth Gospel (Collectanea Biblica et Religiosa Antiqua I). Brussel, Koninklijke Academie, 1988. xvii-563 p. 18 x 26. 2,700 BF.

Vetus Latina, Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel. 25 (Pars II). Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos. 6. Lieferung Hbr 5,8-7,10. Hrsg. H. Frede. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1989. pp. 1237-1316. 24 x 32.

Westerholm, Stephen, *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith*. Paul and his Recent Interpreters. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988. 238 p. 13,5 x 21,2. \$14.95.

Varia

Carmody, Denise L. – Carmody, John T., *Peace and Justice in the Scriptures of the World Religions: Reflections on Non-Christian Scriptures*. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1988. 191 p. 13,5 × 20,2. \$9.95.

Eaton, Michael A., *Baptism with the Spirit*. The teaching of Martyn Lloyd-Jones. Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1989. 253 p. 13,5 × 21. £6.95.

Excavations and Surveys in Israel 1987/88. Volume 6. English Edition of Hadashot Arkheologiyot. Jerusalem, The Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums, 1988. 120 p. 21,8 × 27,4.

Girardo, C., *Eucaristia per la Chiesa*. Prospettive teologiche sull'eucaristia a partire dalla «lex orandi» (Aloisiana 22): Roma, E.P.U.G. – Brescia, Morcelliana Editrice, 1989. xxi-679 p. 17 × 24. L. 58.000.

Hadas-Lebel, Mireille, *Flavius Josephus*. Le Juif de Rome. Paris, Fayard, 1989. 298 p. 13,8 × 22. 110,00 FF.

Hengel, Martin, *The Zealots*. Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1989. xxiv-487 p. 16,5 × 24. £29.95.

Herr, Mireille, *Les tragédies bibliques au XVIII^e siècle*. Paris-Genève, Champion-Slatkine, 1988. 268 p. 15 × 22.

Kiraz, George Anton, *The Syriac Primer*. Reading, Writing, Vocabulary and Grammar with Exercises and Cassette Activities (JSOT Manuals 5). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1989. 273 p. 22 × 29,7. £8.95/\$14.50.

Lee, Bernard J., *The Galilean Jewishness of Jesus*. Retrieving the Jewish Origins of Christianity (Studies in Judaism and Christianity). Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1988. 158 p. 14 × 21,4. \$7.95.

Meier, Samuel A., *The Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 45). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989. xvii-269 p. 14,5 × 22,3. \$13.95.

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

TIPOGRAFIA POLIGLOTTA DELLA PONTIFICIA UNIVERSITÀ GREGORIANA
PIAZZA DELLA PILOTTA, 4 - ROMA